DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 709 TM 820 856

TITLE	Project Evaluation Reports and Progress Reports: 1981-82.
INSTITUTION	Tulsa Public Schools, Okla.
PUB DATE	Aug 82
NOTE	135p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Development; Early Childhood Education; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Mathematics; *Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Reading; Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS	*Tulsa Public Schools OK

ABSTRACT

This document contains the project descriptions, objectives, evaluation procedures and results, summary and conclusions, as well as recommendations for the 1981-82 Project Evaluation Reports and Progress Reports of the Tulsa Public Schools. Part 1 contains the project evaluations of: (1) advanced placement curriculum, (2) art/drama gifted and talented, (3) centers for gifted elementary students, (4) differentiated staffing for health services, (5) district staff development, (6) elementary magnet school staff development, (7) English as a second language, (8) footsteps for fours - early childhood development and parent involvement program, (9) improving school effectiveness, (10) language arts skills instruction, (11) multi-school librarians, (12) museum studios in the studio arts, (13) philharmonic youth concert, and (14) Spanish immersion. Part 2 contains the progress reports on: (1) basic reading learning centers, (2) career education for life's sake, (3) community resource center for the arts and humanities, (4) early childhood education, (5) elementary developmental mathematics, (6) elementary magnet schools, (7) elementary mathematics management system, (8) elementary reading management system, (9) junior high learning centers, (10) mathematics management/microcomputer mathematics, (11) minimum competency testing standards, and (12) secondary English/reading skills immersion. (Author/PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223709

TM

PROJECT EVALUATION REPORTS

and

Progress Reports

1981-82

Prepared by

the

Department of Evaluation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Roger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 820 856

Division for Instructional Support Services

Tulsa Public Schools
Tulsa, Oklahoma

August, 1982

PROJECT EVALUATION REPORTS
and
Progress Reports
1981-82

Prepared by

the

Department of Evaluation

Mr. Stan Harrison, Coordinator

Dr. Barbara Dewell, Evaluation Assistant

Dr. Paul I. McCloud
Associate Superintendent for
Instructional Support Services

Tulsa Public Schools

Tulsa, Oklahoma

August, 1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I: Project Evaluations

	Projects	Schools	Directors	Page
1.	Advanced Placement Curriculum	Washington	Don Hoopert	1
2.	Art/Drama Gifted and Talented	Nimitz	Bobbie Brophy Anita Dugger	9
3.	Centers for Gifted Elementary Students	Barnard, Burroughs, Carnegie, Cooper, Emerson, Fulton, Grissom, Hoover, Key, Lee, Mayo, Park, Patrick Henry, Peary, Phillips, Salk	Dale Edmond Larry Webber	14
4.	Differentiated Staffing for Health Services	Alcott, Cherokee, Gilcrease, Monroe, Penn	Mary Jane Walker	20
5.	District Staff Development	All schools	John Dewell	25
6.	Elementary Magnet School Staff Development	Burroughs, Frost, Hawthorne, Roosevelt, Whitman	Robert Burton	33
7.	English as a Second Language	All schools	Patsy Buckley	38
8.	Footsteps for Fours	MacArthur, Robertson	Sandra Nicholson	42
9.	Improving School Effectiveness	Hawthorne, Houston, Lindsey, Post	Dale Edmond Larry Webber	48
10.	Language Arts Skills Instruction	Eliot	Margherite LaPota	53
11.	Multi-School Librarians	Addams, Barnard, Bates, Bunche, Celia Clinton, Cherokee, Chouteau, Columbus, Eugene Field, Franklin, Grimes, Jones, Kerr, Lee, MacArthur, Mayo, Park, Springdale	Eva Roberts	55

	Projects	Schools	Directors	Page
12.	Museum Studies in the Studio Arts	Barnard, Burroughs, Carnegie, Cooper, Emerson, Fulton, Grissom, Hoover, Key, Lee, Mayo, Park, Patrick Henry, Peary, Phillips, Salk	Dale Edmond Larry Webber	64
13.	Philharmonic Youth Concert	All elementary schools	Don Linde	72
14.	Spanish Immersion	Eliot	Patsy Buckley	76

PART II: Progress Reports

	Projects	Schools	Directors	Page
1.	Basic Reading Learning Centers	Addams, Alcott, Bryant, Burroughs, Cherokee, Eugene Field, Frost, Greeley, Hawthorne, Houston, Jackson, Lindsey, Penn, Post, Remington, Riley, Roosevelt, Sequoyah, Springdale, Woods	Regina Holloway	82
2.	Career Education for Life's Sake	All schools	Susan Babbitt	85
3.	Community Resource Center for the Arts and Humanities	All schools	Anita Dugger	89
4.	Early Childhood Education	Burroughs, Grimes, Hawthorne, Roosevelt	Sandra Nicholson	92
5.	Elementary Developmental Mathematics	Alcott, Bunche, Burroughs, Celia Clinton, Cherokee, Eugene Field, Frost, Greeley, Hawthorne, Houston, Jackson, Lindsey, Mark Twain, Penn, Post, Remington, Riley, Roosevelt, Sequoyah, Springdale, Whitman, Whittier, Woods	Jane Burgess	100

	Projects	Schools	Directors	Page
6.	Elementary Magnet Schools	Burroughs, Frost, Hawthorne, Roosevelt, Whitman	Nancy McDonald	103
7.	Elementary Mathematics Management System	Emerson, Frost, Fulton, Grimes, Hawthorne, Hoover, Jones, Mitchell, Ross, Sandburg, Whitman, Whittier	J. W. Hosey	105
8.	Elementary Reading Management System	Addams, Alcott, Barnard, Bunche, Burroughs, Celia Clinton, Cherokee, Columbus, Emerson, Eugene Field, Frost, Grimes, Lee, MacArthur, Marshall, Mayo, McClure, McKinley, Mitchell, Patrick Henry, Phillips, Post, Riley	Regina Holloway	109
9.	Junior High Learning Center	All junior high schools	Jacques Cunningham	113
10.	Mathematics Management/ Microcomputer Mathematics	Carver	Jack Skelton	116
11.	Minimum Competency Testing Standards	All schools	Jack Griffin	119
12.	Secondary English/ Reading Skills Immersion	Bell, Foster, Memorial	Margherite LaPota	121

SUMMARY

Part I: Project Evaluations

	Projects	Conclusions	Recommendations
1.	Advanced Placement Curriculum	In a survey returned by 27 gradutates, 17 passed exams to qualify and 10 received college credit for advanced placement courses.	Counselors should emphasize the rigorous academic and time requirements of advanced placement courses.
2.	Art/Drama Gifted and Talented	Forty students identified as talented reported that they develop attitudes about themselves and their talents.	The curriculum should be organized into a yearly timetable of topics, activities and field trips.
3.	Centers for Gifted Elementary Students	Teachers, students and parents responded favorably to the program of activities.	A writing team should be established to develop a flexible curriculum of enrichment activities and options for special interests to be used in all centers.
4.	Differentiated Staffing for Health Services	Most of the principals and office staffs reported that the addition of a health clerk improved the health services offered to children at their schools.	The health office should be located in the school office area, but out of the traffic pattern to office machines, telephones, restrooms, or kitchen facilities.
5.	District Staff Development	Eighty-eight percent of the participants reported that the staff development activities met their needs.	A new needs assessment should be prepared and be administered by January, 1983.

	Projects	Conclusions	Recommendations
6.	Elementary Magnet School Staff Development	Thirty-eight percent of the participants reported that they had a better understanding of their role in the magnet school.	The elementary generalists should be involved with the school planning teams to provide assistance with the development of the proposals.
7.	English as a Second Language	Students in the English immersion center achieved higher levels of English proficiency than did other ESL students.	A full-time administrator should be assigned to the center to coordinate the program.
8.	Footsteps for Fours	Parents reported that their children were developing the desired skills as intended in the program.	Additional materials and playground equipment should be provided.
9.	Improving School Effectiveness	No change in the rate of achievement in basic skills could be identified as a result of the staff development activities.	The Tulsa Teacher Effectiveness Program should replace the program of classroom visitations to observe characteristics of effective teaching.
10.	Language Arts Skills Immersion	Students using the new language arts series attained approximately the same level of achievement as students using other materials.	The program should be used as a supplement to help identify individual students with deficiencies in language arts.
11.	Multi-School Librarians	Sixty-six percent of the teachers reported that the program met the library needs in their schools.	There is a need to clarify the role of the librarian and the responsibility of the school staff to maintain the program.
12.	Museum Studies in The Studio Arts	Parents, children and teachers indicated that they thought art instruction in the studio setting was a challenging experience.	The program should be modified to reduce the time spent in one medium and the time spent away from regular classes.

	Projects	Conclusions	Recommendations
13.	Philharmonic Youth Concerts	Administrators and teachers reported that they thought the program was a valuable aesthetic experience for the children.	More time should be spent in classrooms preparing the students for the program and establishing guidelines for behavior in a concert auditorium.
14.	Spanish Immersion	Ninety-five percent of the parents reported that the children have demonstrated satisfactory growth socially, physically and intellectually.	Classroom facilities and materials should be studied to determine what improvements can be made to meet the requirements of the program.

Part II: Progress Reports

	Projects	Conclusions
1.	Basic Reading Learning Centers	Learning center students achieved at a higher rate than did underachievers in the regular reading classes.
2.	Career Education for Life's Sake	The business and academic communities responded favorably to presentations and workshops concerning the infusion of career education into the curriculum.
3.	Community Resource Center for the Arts and Humanities	More than 1,200 artist hours were utilized in classroom presentations in the areas of visual arts, drama, music and dance.
4.	Early Childhood Education	Staff development activities were provided and developmental programs were implemented as designed.
5.	Elementary Developmental Mathematics	Underachievers in developmental mathematics classes achieved at a higher rate than did underachievers in regular mathematics classes.

	Projects	Conclusions
6.	Elementary Magnet Schools	Recruitment activities resulted in white memberships in the magnet schools ranging from 17% to 50%.
7.	Elementary Mathematics Management System	The program operated at various levels of utilization among the schools and was not uniformly implemented.
8.	Elementary Reading Management System	Many program materials were used in each school but the program was not uniformly implemented.
9.	Junior High Learning Center	Most junior high counselors reported that students benefited from attending the learning center.
10.	Mathematics Management/ Microcomputer Mathematics	The management system was not fully implemented as designed by the publisher and teachers reported that most students needed more time on the computer.
11.	Minimum Competency Testing Standards	Classes in New Century reading and developmental mathematics were provided for 461 third graders who fell at or below a composite grade-equivalent score of 2-9 on the SRA Achievement Series.
12.	Secondary English/Reading Skills Immersion	Larger gains were made in comprehension than in vocabulary skills as measured by standardized tests.

Part I: Project Evaluations

ADVANCED PLACEMENT CURRICULUM
An Evaluation Report

Project Description

The advanced placement curriculum was first offered at Booker T. Washington High School during the 1980-81 school year to serve as a magnet feature of the Tulsa Public Schools. At the beginning of the 1981-82 school year, class lists indicated that eighty-eight enrollments were reported in nine advanced placement classes.

The courses offered were intended to appeal to juniors and seniors who were interested in advanced study in mathematics, science, history, foreign languages and music. The material covered in these classes was beyond what was traditionally offered in a high school curriculum and demanded a higher level of writing, discussion and research skills. The student who enrolled in advanced placement courses was expected to have a strong academic background and a history of achieving at a high level.

After completing a course, students could elect to take the Advanced Placement Examinations offered through the College Board Testing program, tests offered through the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP), or placement examinations given by many individual colleges. Individual colleges differ in policy regarding acceptance of courses and minimum test score requirements for receiving credit.

In addition to an academic appeal, the courses were intended to have an economic appeal as the cost was relatively inexpensive compared to the cost of courses offered on a college campus. It was theoretically possible through this program for a student to enter college with enough credits to be classified as a sophomore.

Project Objectives

1. To enable program students to receive advanced-placement credit in college.

2. To offer classes which attract the academically-talented student to attend a magnet school.

Evaluation Procedures and Results

Objective 1

As a result of an evaluation of the advanced placement curriculum conducted during the 1980-81 school year, it was recommended that students participating in the advanced placement curriculum be contacted in a follow-up study.

The achievement of Objective 1 was evaluated by analyzing the results of a survey sent to parents of students who participated in advanced placement classes during the 1980-81 school year.

Student Survey for College Students

According to school records, thirty-three seniors were enrolled in one advanced placement course, twelve seniors in two courses and three seniors in three courses. A total of forty-eight seniors were enrolled in advanced placement courses in 1980-81. The survey was mailed to the parents of these forty-eight students in the Fall of 1981. Surveys were completed and returned by twenty-seven parents or students. The results obtained from the survey follow.

1. Which advanced placement courses did you take at Booker T. Washington High School during the 1980-81 school year?

Courses	Number of Students	Courses	Number of Students
Calculus	14	Spanish	3
Chemistry	8	Music Theory	2
U.S. History	8	Physics	2
French	3	Biology	1

2. Did you take the Advanced Placement Examinations offered at Booker T. Washington High School?

Yes 12 No 15

3. Did you take other examinations to receive college credit?

Yes 6 No 21

If yes, what kind of exam? What subject?

Texas A & M Advanced Placement	English, Chemistry, Math
Placement exams at Reed College	German
Placement exams	Chemistry, Russian, Calculus
Chemistry Lab Proficiency Exam	Chemistry
Local exam	Calculus
CLEP College Composition	Freshman English

4. Were you awarded college credit for any of your advanced placement classes?

Yes 10 No 15 No Response 2

If yes, list courses and number of college semester credits.

Course	Number of Credits	Number of Responses
Calculus	1 credit	2
	4 credits	1
	5 credits	1
	6 credits	3
Chemistry	1 credit	1
	not reported	1
Russian	not reported	1
Spanish	not reported	1
	17 credits	1
French	17 credits	1
U.S. History	6 credits	1
Pre Calculus Math	3-5 credits	1

Unsolicited comments regarding this question follow.

- I could have gotten four calculus credits.
- My college recognizes only a four or five on the AP exam.
- I got no credit, but was advanced to second or third year classes.
- OSU would not give me credit for the course.
- I did not wish to receive college credit.

5. Did you receive college credit for courses other than advanced placement courses?

Yes 5 No 22

If yes, list courses and number of college semester credits.

Course	Number of Credits	Number of Responses
German	3 credits	1
English	3 credits	1
Chemistry Lab.	2 credits	1
CLEP Freshman English	3 credits	2
CLEP College Composition	3 credits	1

6. Did your participation in the advanced placement curriculum prove beneficial in any other way? Please explain.

Responses to this question were categorized as follows:

Responses	Number of Responses
Provided preparation which made the college course much easier	7
Provided experience in what to expect from college level course	6
Improved background basis for subjects	5
Improved study habits	3

7. Do you have any other comments to make about the advanced placement curriculum?

Responses to this question were categorized as follows:

Responses	Number of Responses
Course requirements of take-home tests were too time-consuming	5
A great opportunity	5
A.P. courses should be continued	5
Good preparation for college	3
Thanks to dedicated teachers	3
Too much emphasis on testing, not enough on learning	3
Provided a challenge and stimulation during senior year	2
Need more emphasis on six to twelve page research papers	1

Advanced Placement Testing Results

Test scores of college students who elected to take Advanced Placement Examinations were analyzed. Twenty-one students took the examinations in nine subject areas. The greatest number of students took the calculus exam. Subject areas and number of students taking the exam are shown below. Following each are the number of students receiving a score of three or above, required by colleges to determine acceptance of credit. One student responded in the survey that his college accepted only a four or or five on the exam. One student took exams in three subject areas, three students took exams in two subjects and seventeen students took exams in only one subject. Seventeen of the twenty-one students passed the exams to qualify for college credit.

	Number of Tests Taken	Number of Tests Passed Scoring 3-5
Calculus AB	9	9
Calculus BC	1	1
American History	4	3
Chemistry	3	2
European History	2	0
French Language	2	1
Music Theory	2	2
Spanish Literature	2	2
Physics	1	0
Total	26	20

Objective 2

The achievement of Objective 2 was evaluated by analyzing responses to a survey completed in the fall of 1981 by students enrolled in advanced placement classes during the 1981-82 school year.

According to class counts at the beginning of the school year the following numbers of students were enrolled in each course and responded to the survey.

Course	Number of Reported Enrollments	Number of Responses to Survey
Calculus	18	13
U. S. History	15	10
Biology	12	8
Spanish III	12	9
Music Theory	11	3
Chemistry II	10	20
European History	4	1
Physics	4	8
French IV	2	2
Total	88	74

In addition, one German student and sixteen students enrolled in a prerequisite math class for calculus responded to the survey, resulting in ninety-one total responses to the student survey.

Student Survey

Student responses are reported in order of their importance to students.

1. Check the two most important reasons for taking this course.

Reason	Percent of Students Responding
To continue interest in an area of study beyond that offered in regular classes.	73%
To save time in college by being able to begin with more advanced courses.	40%
To make my transcript more attractive to the college of my choice.	30%
To assist in receiving financial aid/ scholarship to the college of my choice.	24%
To save money in lieu of the cost of a college course.	21%

2. How important a factor were the advanced placement course offerings in your decision to attend Washington High School?

Response	Percent of Students Responding
Somewhat important	37%
Very important	32%
Not important	31%

3. At this time, how do you intend to use your advanced placement course work?

Intention	Percent of Students Responding
To receive further knowledge	86%
To develop study habits which will be helpful in college	68%
To take Advanced Placement Examinations	67%
To take examinations offered at my college	30%
To take CLEP examinations	21%

Students were also asked to make any comments they would like about advanced placement courses. Most of these comments were positive. Comments were categorized and are reported below.

Comment	Number of Responses
Prepares students for college	10
Good learning or study experience	8
Teachers are great, make it interesting	8
Good idea. Best thing going on in Tulsa Public Schools	7
Should offer more A.P. courses	4
Offers a challenge, stimulation	3
Good background in subject	3
Very difficult, definitely college level (history, calculus, chemistry)	3
Not everyone should take them	2
A.P. test is not accepted by major universities	2
Teachers should explain more	1
Not very happy with course	1

Summary and Conclusions

Objective 1: To enable program students to receive advanced-placement credit in college.

This objective was partially achieved.

- Ten of the twenty-four students (42%) who responded to the survey received college credit for their advanced placement courses. Seventeen of the twenty-one students (81%) who elected to take the advanced placement exams passed the exams to qualify for college credit. The calculus course was the most successful in meeting this objective as ten students took and passed the exam.

- Perhaps the program objective as established by educators was not compatible with the objective on the part of the students who enrolled in advance placement classes. Both surveys, those completed by 1981 graduates and those by students enrolled in advanced placement classes during the 1981-82 school year, indicated that most students see the course itself as the end result. Comments regarding the courses were positive regardless of whether students received or intended to receive college credit for the course work. Graduates of 1981 indicated that they viewed advanced placement classes as a great opportunity and good preparation for college. The most popular reason given by students for enrolling in advanced placement courses was that the students wanted to learn more than what was offered in a regular class.

Objective 2: To offer classes which attract the academically-talented student to attend a magnet school.

This objective was achieved.

- Although most students who are now enrolled in advanced placement classes enrolled at Booker T. Washington before the advanced placement courses were available, a total of 69% of the students indicated that advanced placement course offerings were an important factor in their decision to attend. The reasons for taking advanced placement classes were predominately academic in nature. The most popular reason was to continue interest in an area of study beyond that offered in regular classes. The second most popular reason was to save time in college by being able to begin with more advanced courses. Less academic reasons regarding transcripts, financial aid and saving money for courses were not the most popular reasons listed by students for taking advanced placement courses.

- At the same time, 86% of the students responded that their intention for using the advanced placement course work was to receive further knowledge. Student comments about the classes were predominately positive and indicated that the opportunity to take advanced placement classes was genuinely appreciated by the students.

Recommendations

1. Advanced placement classes should continue to be offered at Booker T. Washington High School to satisfy the needs of the academically-talented student for challenge and stimulation.

2. In the fall of 1980, 107 enrollments were reported in nine advanced placement classes. School records at the end of the year indicated 79 completed courses. The difference must be explained by students who enrolled in courses in the fall and then dropped the class. Counselors should stress to students the rigorous demands of an advanced placement class so that students who enroll complete the course. Although the printed matter describing advanced placement classes indicates that advanced placement courses are more demanding, students should be encouraged to consider the extra time demands before enrolling in advanced placement courses.

3. During the 1980-81 school year, 79 advanced placement course-credits were awarded to 62 juniors and seniors in nine advanced placement courses. Considering the average teacher salary to be $20,000 annually, the teacher cost of the program to the school district would be $36,000 or approximately $455 per course-credit. Class materials are in addition to this figure. More academically-talented students should be recruited for enrollment in advanced placement classes to make the program more cost-effective in terms of class size.

ART/DRAMA GIFTED AND TALENTED
An Evaluation Report

Project Description

In compliance with state legislation passed in 1981, the Tulsa Public Schools began implementation of programs to serve students who were identified as gifted and talented children. According to Senate Bill 214, gifted and talented children are "those children identified at the preschool, elementary and secondary level as having demonstrated potential abilities of high performance capability and needing differentiated or accelerated education or services." Gifted child educational programs may be implemented during a three-year period beginning with the 1981-82 school year. The Tulsa Public Schools began the elementary program during the 1981-82 school year, will begin the junior high program during the 1982-83 school year, and begin the high school program during the 1983-84 school year.

In response to the state legislation, the instructional assistants for art and speech developed a pilot program for the gifted and talented in the areas of art and drama to be implemented during the 1981-82 school year. In early 1981, the art and drama instructional assistants established a committee to plan a pilot program for eighth and ninth-grade students at Nimitz Junior High during the 1981-82 school year. The committee included Nimitz students, parents, teachers, a counselor and an administrator. The committee developed criteria for admission to the program, which included an application/nomination form, faculty recommendations, the composite score from the SRA Achievement Series, and the rating of either an art portfolio or a dramatic audition. The program was designed to serve twenty students in each area.

A student requesting admission to the art program was required to present an art portfolio containing seven pieces of work representing a minimum of three media. These pieces were judged on the basis of variety, creativity, functional use, appreciation, application, design and composition.

A student requesting admission to the drama program prepared a dramatic audition. The student was judged on the basis of delivery and characterization.

During the summer of 1981, the two teachers for the program worked for one week with the art and drama instructional assistants to develop a curriculum guide for classroom activities. The program of activities was designed to create an artistic environment for gifted and talented students and to take advantage of community resources for field trips as well as for intern situations. In addition, both teachers attended a summer workshop which featured a consultant in the area of teaching the gifted and talented student.

Project Objectives

1. To implement a program in art to meet the individual needs of students identified as gifted and talented in art.
2. To implement a program in drama to meet the individual needs of students identified as gifted and talented in drama.
3. To develop a program of testing to identify talent in the areas of art and drama.

Evaluation Procedures and Results

Objective 1 and Objective 2

The achievement of Objective 1 and Objective 2 was evaluated by analyzing the results of questionnaires completed by students and parents.

Student Survey

In May, 1982, students in the art and drama classes were asked to complete a survey about their class experiences. The results for 20 art students and 24 drama students follow.

	Yes Responses	
	Art	Drama
1. Do you feel that you have learned something new in your class?	100%	92%
2. Do you feel that you have learned things in this class that have helped you in other classes?	20%	87%
3. Has participation in this program changed your attitude toward yourself and your talent?	65%	96%
4. Has participation in this program changed your attitude toward understanding the meaning of "gifted" or "talented?"	75%	62%
5. If you were given the opportunity, would you want to continue in the gifted/talented program?	90%	79%

The students were asked to make suggestions for improving the art/drama program. Both art and drama students suggested more field trips, speakers and demonstrations. Another suggestion that was often mentioned was that the classes be limited to ninth-grade students.

Students were also asked for comments regarding the program. Comments from both classes were positive about the program, but comments from drama students reflected disappointment at not being able to continue in a program in high school.

Parent Survey

In May, 1982, parents of students enrolled in the art and drama classes were asked to complete a questionnaire about the program. Eleven parents of art students and three parents of drama students responded as shown.

	Yes Responses	
	Art	Drama
1. Has your child enjoyed the opportunity of participating in the special art/drama program this year?	91%	100%
2. Have the program activities been challenging and rewarding to your child?	64%	67%
3. Has the program met your expectations of a program designed for students with special talents?	64%	34%
4. Would you recommend that this program be continued?	82%	100%
5. Would you recommend this program to your friends and their children?	91%	100%

Parents were asked which activities of the program their children enjoyed the most. Responses from the parents of art students were field trips and specific art activities such as silk-screening and drawing. Parents of drama students mentioned participation in plays, speech competitions and tournaments.

Parents were asked to make suggestions for improving the art/drama program. Parents of art students suggested opportunities to see artists using different techniques or unusual media. Parents of drama students suggested exposure to other aspects of theater arts.

Parents offered several favorable comments about both programs but expressed hopes that the programs could be refined to meet students' needs and expectations about a "special program."

Objective 3

The achievement of Objective 3 was evaluated by analyzing the results of tests and performance assessments of students.

In an attempt to discover a means of detecting student talent in the areas of art and drama, students who enrolled in the program were given a battery of tests. The battery included the Watson-Glasser Critical Thinking Test, Torance Tests of Creativity and the Vocational Preference Inventory. In addition, the SRA composite and subtest scores were used. A performance score was assigned each student by the teacher of the class.

The scores of students on the Watson-Glasser Critical Thinking Test correlated significantly with the SRA total reading and the SRA-EAS scores for students in both art and drama. Since the SRA total reading and SRA-EAS scores are readily available for students in the Tulsa Public Schools, these scores could serve as an alternative for testing in the area of "Critical Thinking." The Watson-Glasser was not successful in predicting student performance in art or drama.

The Torance Tests of Creativity, both Visual and Verbal, were not satisfactory for use in determining success in a gifted/ talented art and drama program. In addition to being expensive to purchase and score, the tests were not well received by students of this age. The overall scores were low, possibly reflecting this lack of student motivation.

For art students, the SRA composite, SRA total reading and SRA total language scores correlated significantly with performance in art. These scores may be useful indicators of success in gifted/talented art programs. No SRA scores were found to correlate with drama performance.

The Vocational Preference Inventory had two scores, Self-Control and Status, which correlated with performance in art and one score, Investigative, which correlated with performance in drama. This test proved to be the most successful in predicting student performance in gifted/talented art and drama classes.

Summary and Conclusions

Objective 1: To implement a program in art to meet the individual needs of students identified as gifted and talented in art.

This objective was generally achieved.

Art student responses indicated that one-hundred percent of the students had learned something new and that ninety percent would want to continue in the gifted/talented program. Eighty-two percent of the parents recommended that the program be continued. Sixty-four percent of the parents answered that the program met their expectations of a program designed for students with special talents.

Objective 2: To implement a program in drama to meet the individual needs of students identified as gifted and talented in drama.

This objective was generally achieved.

Ninety-two percent of the drama students felt that they had learned something new and seventy-nine percent wanted to continue in the gifted/talented program. One-hundred percent of the parents recommended that the program be continued, yet only thirty-four percent said that the program met their expectations of a program designed for students with special talents.

Objective 3: To develop a program of testing to identify talent in the areas of art and drama.

This objective was achieved.

Several tests were found to be useful in the identification of talent in art and drama.

Recommendations

1. This program should be continued. Both art and drama should be offered to students who are gifted and talented in these areas.

2. The established procedure for the selection of students in both programs should be continued. In addition, the Gifted Child Education Identification Procedures for Elementary, Middle, and Junior High Schools guide prepared by the Department of Psychological Services and Testing should be included in the selection process.

3. The various tests which were successful in predicting student performance should be used when appropriate.

4. Now that the teachers of these programs have had an opportunity to establish a curriculum, this curriculum should be organized into a yearly timetable of topics, activities, field trips and visitations. This curriculum should be made available to parents of students so that the parents know what is to be expected in the program.

CENTERS FOR GIFTED ELEMENTARY STUDENTS
An Evaluation Report

Project Description

In compliance with state legislation passed in 1981, the Tulsa Public Schools began the implementation of programs to serve students who were identified as gifted and talented children. According to Senate Bill 214, gifted and talented children are "those children identified at the preschool, elementary and secondary level as having demonstrated potential abilities of high performance capability and needing differentiated or accelerated education or services." Gifted child educational programs may be implemented during a three-year period beginning with the 1981-82 school year. The Tuls Public Schools began the elementary program during the 1981-82 school year, will begin the junior high program during the 1982-83 school year, and begin the high school program during the 1983-84 school year.

In response to the state legislation, the Department of Psychological Services and Testing established a criteria for selection. The criteria included a parent application, a behavior checklist, standardized test scores and letter grade ratings. A placement team was recommended for each building to analyze the documents submitted for each student. State funds are available to assist in supporting gifted child educational programs based upon the number of students meeting the criteria established by the Tulsa Public Schools.

Centers for Gifted Elementary Students were established in sixteen elementary schools, giving consideration to the number of gifted students identified in the schools, existing programs in the schools to serve gifted students and geographic location. In the spring of 1981, teacher positions for the gifted child educational programs were advertised and twelve teachers were selected for the program. Four of these teachers served two schools each on a split schedule. Schools offering gifted child educational programs were Barnard, Burroughs, Carnegie, Cooper, Emerson, Fulton, Grissom, Hoover, Key, Lee, Mayo, Park, Patrick Henry, Peary, Phillips and Salk.

Project Objectives

1. To identify, screen and select students for participation in gifted child educational programs.
2. To develop a curriculum to serve the needs of gifted students.

3. To provide staff development activities for teachers of gifted students.

4. To provide enrichment activities to challenge gifted students.

Evaluation Procedures and Results

The achievement of the objectives was evaluated by documenting and observing the procedures for student selection, curriculum development, staff development and implementation of enrichment activities for identified students. To determine if the program was meeting student needs, a questionnaire was sent to parents of students participating in the Centers.

Student Identification and Selection

In August of 1981, the Department of Psychological Services and Testing distributed the Gifted Child Education Identification Procedures guide. This guide contained a summary of the legislation, a description of the characteristics of a gifted child, eligibility requirement for grades one through six, and copies of the various forms to be completed for screening and selection.

As reported to the Oklahoma State Department of Education in November of 1981, 512 students in first through sixth grades were identified and participated in Centers for Gifted Elementary Students. Fifty-one elementary students were identified but not served by a gifted child educational program.

In February of 1982, the Department of Psychological Services and Testing distributed the Gifted Child Education Identification Procedures for Elementary, Middle, and Junior High Schools guide. This guide contained revisions of some procedures and added eligibility requirements for grades seven through nine.

Curriculum Development

Friday of each week was established for Center teachers to meet together to plan the program and develop curriculum. Although teachers discussed, shared ideas and developed activities for use in Centers, a curriculum was not established to serve gifted students.

Staff Development Activities

In preparation for teaching gifted students, Center teachers attended workshops and training sessions throughout the 1981-82 school year. The teachers were trained in the use of computers and attended several workshops on gifted child education and the State Conference for Gifted Education. At the regular Friday meetings, the teachers presented information gained in individual research with the group and several group study projects were presented.

Program Activities

Eight of the schools in the program had been Centers for Special Activities and many of the teachers had been working with students of above-average ability in these Centers. Many of the activities available in these Centers have been modified for use with the gifted children. In addition, students participated in the Museum Studies in the Studio Arts program offered by Philbrook Art Center.

In May of 1982, parents of students participating in the Centers were asked to complete a survey about the program. A total of 338 parent surveys were returned, with 70 for first and second graders, and 268 for grades three through six.

	Yes Responses	
	Gr. 1-2	Gr.3-6
1. Has your child enjoyed the opportunity to work with other gifted students?	96%	98%
2. Have the topics of study in the Center been challenging to your child?	83%	92%
3. Have the activities in the Center been challenging and rewarding to your child?	90%	93%
4. Has the scheduling of Center activities proved satisfactory?	80%	78%
5. Would you find it helpful to have meetings for parents of gifted students?	60%	64%
6. Would you like your child to continue participating in a Center for Gifted Elementary Students?	97%	96%

Parents were asked if there was a particular Center activity that challenged and stimulated their children more than others. The answers to this question were many, but the diversity of answers attested to the variety of interests of gifted children.

Numerous comments indicated an appreciation for a program that some parents felt was long overdue. Many parents mentioned that it was their child's favorite class or that the teacher's enthusiasm for learning was contagious. Suggestions included extending the class time, providing carry-over to the regular classroom, and preparing a definite organized plan for activities that could be communicated to parents.

Some parents expressed a concern about the additional workload on their children. Another concern expressed by some parents was the cooperation of the regular classroom teachers. Apparently there was a lack of it in some situations.

Summary and Conclusions

Objective 1: To identify, screen and select students for participation in gifted child educational programs.

This objective was achieved.

- Two guides were prepared for use in the identification, screening and selection process.
- There were 563 children identified and 512 participated in gifted educational programs.

Objective 2: To develop a curriculum to serve the needs of gifted students.

This objective was not achieved.

No complete curriculum of activities was developed for Centers for Gifted Elementary Students.

Objective 3: To provide staff development activities for teachers of gifted students.

This objective was achieved.

Staff development activities were provided through regular weekly meetings and special workshops.

Objective 4: To provide enrichment activities to challenge gifted students.

This objective was achieved.

- Ninety percent of parents with children in first and second grades and ninety-three percent of parents with children in grades three through six replied that the Center activities were challenging to their children.
- The Museum Studies in the Studio Arts program was reported by students and parents as an enjoyable and valuable experience.

Recommendations

1. Selection criteria for acceptance into elementary gifted child educational programs should be examined in light of the intent of the state guidelines. The multi-selection criteria suggested by the state was intended as an inclusive measure. The Tulsa Public Schools criteria for acceptance results in a smaller number of students in our elementary program. Parents of borderline students who do not meet the guidelines may soon discover that surrounding school districts will accept their children into gifted child educational programs. This may result in a loss of gifted students to neighboring public schools as well as to private schools.

2. Before continuing to develop the gifted child educational program, it is essential to establish a district philosophy for gifted child education. This philosophy can then serve as a guide for further development of the program from grades one through twelve. This philosophy should be established by the instructional specialists, with teachers of the program serving as advisors.

3. As might be expected of a new program, the first year did not permit time to develop curriculum as well as implement a new program. A curriculum should be developed for each grade level. The curriculum should take the following criteria into account:

   a. District philosophy of gifted child education.
   b. Subject area acceleration of existing curriculum.
   c. Subject area enrichment of existing curriculum.
   d. Socialization needs of gifted students.
   e. Special materials and equipment needed for the Centers.
   f. Successful activities used by teachers this year.
   g. Cross-discipline studies and activities.

   The teachers for the program were selected because of their special teaching abilities. Since their expertise is not necessarily in the area of curriculum writing, the burden of developing a curriculum should not fall on their shoulders. The curriculum-writing committee should avail itself of the expertise of the elementary generalists and the subject area specialists. These experts will be able to assure that the curriculum for the gifted child enriches and accelerates the existing curriculum.

   A uniform curriculum throughout the system will eliminate the need for Centers to compete with one another for students and the need for parents to "shop" for a Center for their child. The curriculum, however, should still be flexible enough to permit teachers and students the opportunity to experiment with special interests.

4. The Centers should be observed throughout the year by the elementary generalists serving those schools. They can suggest further changes and advise the teachers on new materials for gifted students as they become available. In addition, subject area specialists should be prepared to advise the teachers on new materials in their subject areas.

5. Meetings for parents of students in the Centers should be held at either the district or the school level. At these meetings, parents could be informed about the philosophy of the program, curriculum, special needs of gifted students, and how to be involved in and supportive of learning at home. In addition, questions about the program could be answered.

6. A program of publicity should be planned through the Office of Public Information to inform the public about the gifted child educational programs available in the Tulsa Public Schools. This would help to remove the mystique now surrounding the program.

DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING FOR HEALTH SERVICES
An Evaluation Report

Project Description

Tulsa Public Schools provides a health program for all schools to maintain, improve and promote the health of children for optimum learning. Thirty-one registered nurses employed by Tulsa Public Schools are assigned to serve from three to four schools each on an established weekly schedule. To increase the efficiency of health education and services in Tulsa Public Schools and to better utilize professional personnel, a program of differentiated staffing was proposed as a pilot project during the 1981-82 school year.

The schools initially involved in the project were Alcott, Cherokee and Penn elementaries, Gilcrease and Monroe junior highs, and East Central and Hale high schools. The project was discontinued at East Central and Hale because of personnel changes made in the fall of 1981. A Pediatric Nurse Assistant served all five schools, and a full-time health clerk was trained and assigned to each of the schools.

The nurse spent a portion of the week in every assigned school supervising the responsibilities of the health clerk. The nurse was also on call for any emergency situation which arose. The health clerk assumed routine duties such as first aid for children who were ill or injured, taking temperatures, calling parents, sitting with ill children until the parents arrive, doing vision and hearing screening, weighing and measuring children and keeping health records up-to-date. The registered nurse was released to engage in activities for which she is trained, particularly in the area of health education.

Project Objectives

1. To implement a program which will improve health services on a full-time basis to schools.

2. To provide full-time health services at approximately the same cost as previous health services.

Evaluation Procedures and Results

Objective 1

The achievement of Objective 1 was evaluated by analyzing the results of surveys completed by the school office staff and by interviewing the health clerks in each of the five participating schools.

School Staff Questionnaire

In February, 1982, the school office staff in each of the five participating schools was asked to respond to a questionnaire concerning the health services in their school. Five principals, three assistant principals, eight counselors and eleven office clerks responded to the survey as follows:

	Yes Responses
1. Do you feel that the health services at your school this year have been as satisfactory as those provided last year?	67%
2. Do you feel that the addition of a health clerk in your school has improved the health services offered to children at your school?	82%
3. Was the health clerk in your school able to perform the health services required?	82%
4. Has the registered nurse's supervision of health services in your school been satisfactory?	96%
5. Have programs for health education for students or staff been conducted in your school this year?	81%
6. Would you recommend this program for health services to other schools in our district?	81%

Because of expressed concerns, the following questions were asked.

	Yes Responses
7. Have you had any health service problems in your school which could not be adequately met by the new program?	26%
8. Have you had any difficulty reaching the registered nurse in an emergency?	11%

Office staff members were asked their opinions regarding the personal qualities and qualifications necessary for a health clerk to perform the health service duties in their schools. The quality most mentioned was an interest in and empathy for the students. The second qualification was a knowledge of first aid procedures as well as knowledge of agencies available for referral. The third and fourth most-mentioned qualities were the ability to follow instructions from the registered nurse and the ability to remain calm in emergencies.

Additional comments regarding the Differentiated Staffing for Health Services were overwhelmingly positive regarding the success of the program, encouraging that the program be continued.

It should be noted that the negative reponses on the school staff questionnaire were all responses from one school. Further investigation indicated that the negative responses were because of a personnel problem within that building and not a reflection of the health services for that school. Although the negative responses were included in reporting the questionnaire results, care should be taken in considering them an accurate reflection of the response to Differentiated Staffing for Health Services.

Health Clerk Interview

In February, 1982, each of the health clerks in the five participating schools and one substitute health clerk responded to a structured interview. The intent of the interview was to provide feedback regarding the implementation of the Differentiated Staffing for Health Services from the viewpoint of the health clerks.

The interview revealed that the health clerks were comfortable with the duties they were asked to perform and felt that their training had prepared them well. All of them indicated that they enjoyed their jobs, especially because they were able to work with children. All of the health clerks indicated that they appreciated the cooperation of the school office staff and felt that they made a contribution to the efficient operation of the health services. The only suggestion for improvement was that the training for health clerks be completed before the start of school.

Objective 2

The achievement of Objective 2 was evaluated by analyzing the costs of providing health services, which consisted primarily of the salaries of the nurses and the health clerks.

The additional cost of a full-time health clerk to a school increased the cost of providing health services to that school by seventy-four percent. However, in areas of the district where health services are in high demand, the savings over providing a full-time nurse to that school were forty-two percent.

Summary and Conclusions

Objective 1: To implement a program which will improve health services on a full-time basis to schools.

This objective was achieved.

- Eighty-two percent of the office staff members reported that the addition of a health clerk had improved the health services offered to children at their schools.
- Sixty-three percent of the office staff members reported that they had not had a health service problem that could not be adequately met by the new system.
- Eighty-two percent of the office staff members reported that the health clerk was able to perform the health services required.
- Eighty-one percent of the office staff members reported that they would recommend this program for health services to other schools in our district.

Objective 2: To provide full-time health services at approximately the same cost as previous health services.

This objective was not achieved.

The additional cost of a full-time health clerk to a school generally increased the cost of providing health services to that school under the present schedule of assignments. However, in areas with a high demand for health services, a decrease in the cost was found.

Recommendations

1. As finances permit, Differentiated Staffing for Health Services should be expanded to other schools. Schools receiving health clerk services should be limited to those with
   a. principals who request the program
   b. a substantial amount of health service needs required presently of the office staff
   c. families that don't take advantage of medical services offered in the community
   d. students who can profit from basic health education because it is not provided in the home or community
   e. a close location to other schools needing health clerks so that the schools can be clustered for the convenience of the registered nurse serving the school
   f. facilities located conveniently to the school office, yet out of the traffic pattern to office machines, telephones, restrooms and kitchen facilities.
2. In schools where health services are not in high demand, costs to the district could be saved by a half-time office clerk/half-time health clerk in each school.

3. Principals should be involved in the hiring procedures for health clerks to serve their schools.

4. The health clerk program should be investigated for serving secondary schools, pairing a high school with a near-by junior high.

5. Training for health clerks should be conducted during the summer months preceding the opening of school so that the health clerks feel confident to begin their duties when school opens. Health clerks should report in the fall at the same time the office clerks report.

6. If the Differentiated Staffing for Health Services is expanded to other schools, each registered nurse should be involved in the training of the health clerks serving her schools to develop the cooperative relationship exhibited in this pilot project.

7. At the beginning of each school year, the entire school staff should be given information regarding the health clerk's services to the school at a staff meeting. The staff should also be reminded of their role and limitations in the health service program provided at their school.

8. The health service office in each school should have privacy for dealing with students' health needs. This office should not house office machines or provide a coffee service area. The restrooms and telephone in that office should not be available for other school uses.

9. Health clerks should wear a smock with a name tag to identify their position. This would prove practical since they work with ill children and a smock would protect their clothing.

10. As counseling problems increase in the health service area, methods of involving community agencies should be investigated to see if local agencies could help the schools share the added responsibilities.

DISTRICT STAFF DEVELOPMENT
An Evaluation Report

Project Description

In an effort to improve the quality of education, the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma enacted House Bill 1706 which, among other things, required each school district to prepare a staff development plan to be submitted to the State Department of Education for approval by July 1, 1981. In response to this legislation, the Tulsa Public Schools established the Tulsa Staff Development Committee (TSDC) in September, 1980. Following State Department of Education regulations, the TSDC was representative of all sectors of the local school community, with a majority of the members being classroom teachers. The original committee included seven teachers, two principals, one instructional assistant, one representative of support personnel and two parents. Changes in the legislation resulted in support personnel staff development being deleted from the program. Another instructional assistant was added to the committee to replace the support personnel representative.

The TSDC met regularly during the 1980-81 school year to prepare the Master Plan for Staff Development. To gain more knowledge in the area of staff development, small groups of TSDC members attended conferences and workshops sponsored by the National Staff Development Council and the National Conference on Inservice Education. In addition, consultants with expertise in staff development were brought to Tulsa to assist the TSDC with preparation of the Master Plan.

The committee established the philosophy and policy statements for staff development to be included in the Master Plan. One policy statement emphasized staff development activities at the building level. Each building staff was to elect a building staff development committee of at least two members. One member was to be an administrator. The duties and responsibilities of the committee members included serving as leaders in planning individual or building level staff development activities. Another policy statement emphasized that although certificated staff members were to earn at least the minimum number of staff development points required, participation in building level or district level activities was to be voluntary.

Following the Regulations for Local Staff Development Programs established by the State Department of Education, the TSDC prepared a needs assessment, project objectives, alternative activities and delivery systems, a record keeping system, and a staff development point systems as components of the Master Plan.

Needs assessment information was gathered informally and formally. In October of 1982, informal teacher-led discussion meetings were held in individual buildings with the cooperation of the Tulsa Classroom Teachers Association (TCTA). The formal needs assessment survey prepared by the TSDC was administered to all certificated staff members in March of 1981. The TCTA building delegate and a building administrator assisted with the survey.

The needs assessment survey contained a staff development checklist of 123 topics from which certificated staff members were to select three top priority needs. The topics and responses from approximately 2,900 certificated staff members were divided into activity categories as shown in the following table.

Activity Categories	Percent of Activity Topics	Percent of Top Priority Response
Personal Development	17%	28%
Professional Development	35%	30%
Curriculum and Instruction	29%	15%
Student Development	19%	20%

The needs assessment survey also included a space for the respondent to write in other topics which were not listed in any of the four categories. Approximately 7% of the top priority needs were represented in this miscellaneous category.

From the results of the needs assessment, program objectives were developed to meet the eleven top priority needs identified in the district composite.

The Master Plan included suggestions for alternative activities which were offered for the district level, department or subject area, building level or individual level. Eighteen specific activities were outlined to meet the eleven top priority needs.

Certificated staff members were offered fifteen alternative delivery systems through which staff development activities were avaiable. Delivery systems included college courses, continuing education courses, independent study, workshops, or conventions.

A record keeping system was established through the office of the coordinator of staff development. The office staff processed the point forms and provided information about activities offered throughout the school year.

The State of Oklahoma provided $114,287 to supplement the district budget to implement the program of activities in the Master Plan during the 1981-82 school year.

Project Objective

To implement a program of staff development activities designed to meet the requirements of the regulations established by the Oklahoma State Department of Education.

Evaluation Procedures and Results

The achievement of the objective was evaluated by analyzing the responses of certificated staff members to questionnaires and surveys, and by documenting the action taken by the TSDC on individual staff development proposals.

During the 1981-82 school year, various activities were provided through many different delivery systems to meet staff development point requirements. Activities were announced through the weekly Superintendent's Bulletin, the monthly Staff Development Info Calendar or various other means such as leaflets and brochures. For as many of these activities as possible, an Activity Evaluation questionnaire was administered to each participant at the completion of the activity. Activity coordinators and participants were encouraged to return the questionnaires, but some activities may not have been evaluated. The following represents a summary of the 1,563 questionnaires returned through July 2, 1982.

	Yes Responses
1. Was the activity informative and useful to you?	98%
2. Was the activity successful in meeting your needs?	88%
3. Will you be able to use the skills or knowledge presented in this activity in your assignment?	86%
4. Do you feel that the things you learned through this activity will result in a greater sense of personal or professional well-being?	91%
5. Would you recommend this activity to others?	88%
6. Would you recommend the consultants used for this activity?	93%
7. Would you change anything about the activity?	28%

The implementation of the total program was evaluated by analyzing the responses of district personnel to an Educator Survey administered in April, 1982. Survey items were based upon the philosophy, policy, operating procedures, and objectives of the program described in the Master Plan. Educators were asked to respond to various program components according to a range of alternatives. The composite of "All of the time" and "Most of the time" responses from 1,050 certificated staff members follows.

		All or Most of the Time
1.	My input is actively sought by my building staff development committee.	42%
2.	My input is utilized by my building staff development committee.	39%
3.	My building staff development committee is providing appropriate, on-going information about district staff development policy, objectives and activities.	56%
4.	My building staff development committee is planning appropriate building level activities.	38%
5.	My building staff development committee is providing appropriate feedback to the Tulsa Staff Development Committee about our staff development questions or needs.	43%
6.	The Tulsa Staff Development Committee is responsive to our building questions or needs.	49%
7.	The Staff Development Office is responsive to our building questions or needs.	48%
8.	The administrative personnel with whom I work support the staff development program by their continuing endorsement of activities offered.	72%
9.	Staff development activities are available in the area of needs I expressed in the needs assessment survey.	59%
10.	Staff development activities are available to increase my competencies in the performance of my assigned duties.	56%
11.	Staff development activities are available to address the needs of the personnel with whom I work.	51%
12.	Staff development activities are available to address the many different roles and responsibilities that I must assume.	49%

		All or Most of the Time
13.	The incentives provided are adequate for me to participate in staff development activities.	53%
14.	Locations of staff development activities are convenient for my attendance.	57%
15.	Staff development activities are scheduled at appropriate times.	50%
16.	The different delivery systems available for staff development activities are appropriate for my needs.	51%
17.	The staff development activities I have attended were very helpful and I have acquired new skills.	58%

The Educator Survey also included a listing of the eleven top priority needs as expressed by district personnel in the March, 1981 needs assessment. The following table lists the priority activities with the percent of expressed needs and the percent indicating participation on the Educator Survey. It was estimated that 2,915 certificated staff participated in the March, 1981 needs assessment and 1,050 certificated staff returned the Educator Survey in April, 1982.

Priority Activity	Expressed Need	Activity Participation
Coping with Stress	19.0%	29%
Improving Discipline	17.0%	27%
Student Motivation and Responsibility	14.2%	26%
Working with Disruptive Students	9.7%	19%
CPR/First Aid	9.2%	4%
Improving School Climate	6.7%	21%
Time Management	6.6%	16%
Teaching Mainstreamed LD Students	6.0%	10%
Understanding Burn-Out	5.9%	6%
Teaching the Gifted Student	5.7%	20%
Classroom Management Skills	5.4%	23%

The TSDC met once each month to consider individual staff development proposals. The following is a report for the total number of proposals submitted up through June 30, 1982.

Number Considered	259
Number Approved for Points Only	95
Number Approved for Points and Funding	68
Number with No Action Needed	38
Number Not Approved	58

Summary and Conclusions

The objective, "To implement a program of staff development activities designed to meet the requirements of the regulations established by the Oklahoma State Department of Education," was generally achieved.

- A Master Plan for Staff Development was prepared by the Tulsa Staff Development Committee and approved by the Oklahoma State Department of Education.
- The Master Plan was in compliance with regulations for local staff development programs. The Master Plan included a needs assessment, program objectives, alternative activities and delivery systems, a record keeping system, and a point system to account for all staff development activities.
- Through July 2, 1982, evaluation forms for 52 staff development activities were submitted. The 1,563 participants responded to the seven survey questions with a composite positive response of 91%.
- Many certificated staff members participated in activities offered in the areas identified as the priority needs in the March, 1981 survey. Since a large number chose not to respond to the Educator Survey in April, 1982, it is not possible to measure how well the needs were met in the priority areas. The survey results indicated that those who did respond generally participated in priority activities to a greater extent than might be expected of the group which responded to the original needs assessment.
- The weakest component appeared to be the building staff development committee. The largest responses of "Seldom" or "Never" in the Educator Survey were to the questions about the functioning of the building committee.
- Revisions are being made in the point system and in the types of activities approved for earning points. The TSDC has been responsive to various opinions expressed by certificated staff about the delivery systems.
- Most of the components of the program are in the process of being revised. The TSDC has been responsive to the various needs for revision which have become evident during the initial year.

Recommendations

1. The Coordinator of Staff Development should be given the authority to develop plans, make decisions, approve individual staff development proposals, and serve as the administrator of the program.

2. Written guidelines for the approval of individual staff development proposals should be established so that the program administrator can make decisions based upon specific criteria. Those proposals which do not fall within the guidelines should be presented to the TSDC for consideration.

3. The TSDC should function as a steering committee to determine philosophy and policy, contribute ideas for the components of the Master Plan, approve yearly revisions of the Master Plan developed by the program administrator, and to approve individual staff development proposals submitted by the program administrator.

4. A new needs assessment survey should be prepared and be administered by January, 1983. The survey should be designed so that the results will be more representative of the needs of the majority of certificated staff members. The top priority need in the March, 1981 needs assessment received 19% of the responses and seven of the fifteen top priority needs were in the category of personal development.

5. The objectives of the program should be limited to those needs receiving at least 60% of the responses or be limited to the top priority need in each of the activity categories of personal development, professional development, curriculum and instruction, and student development.

6. Individual building level staff development committees should involve more of their staff members in building level activities and districtwide activities. Periodic reports of building activities should be sent from each building to the TSDC.

7. Revisions in the activities and delivery systems sections in the Master Plan should be continued to narrow the range of offerings.

8. Efforts should be continued to revise the point form and record keeping system to reduce the volume of paper to be processed.

9. The staff development funds should be allocated on a monthly basis or by some other means to avoid a surplus in June.

10. The TSDC should continue efforts to work with State Department of Education representatives to ensure that the Tulsa Public Schools are in compliance with regulations for local staff development programs.

ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOL STAFF DEVELOPMENT
An Evaluation Report

Project Description

In March of 1981, the Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies (SWCHRS) submitted a proposal to the United States Department of Education requesting $93,856 to be used for staff development activities for Burroughs, Frost, Hawthorne, Roosevelt and Whitman elementary schools. The amount of $56,811 was approved by the Department of Education and the Tulsa Public Schools agreed to provide $12,000 for the activities to be implemented during the 1981-82 school year.

The staff development activities focused upon the the implementation of the Plan for Further Desegregation, prepared by the Tulsa Public Schools in April, 1979. The Plan included the establishment of the five elementary magnet schools to be fully operational in the fall of 1980. In the spring of 1981, the program specialist of SWCHRS met with district administrators to determine needs as perceived by personnel at the schools. Activities were developed to meet unique needs identified by each school staff as well as the commonly expressed needs for assistance in working with children having different learning styles and for the differences associated with multi-cultural origins.

A planning team consisting of the principal and two teachers from each school and the Coordinator of Community Services/Human Relations met with the program specialist from SWCHRS to develop the program of activities for the project and prepare agendas for two one-day workshops for the staff of the magnet schools. In addition, a school team was established in each school to implement individual building plans under the supervision of the SWCHRS program specialist.

Project Objective

To implement a program of staff development activities designed to provide magnet school personnel with more knowledge about the Plan for Further Desegregation and their role in providing equal educational opportunity.

Evaluation Procedures and Results

The achievement of the objective was evaluated by analyzing responses of magnet school staff members to questionnaires concerning the various workshops conducted for the total staff as well as for the individual building staff.

In August, 1981, the certificated staff in the five magnet schools met at the Education Service Center for a one-day workshop which was designed to clarify the purpose of the magnet school and to investigate various learning styles. At the close of the workshop, each participant completed the evaluation form used regularly in the district staff development program. The composite of responses from 115 participants follows.

		Yes Responses
1.	Was the activity informative and useful to you?	96%
2.	Was the activity successful in meeting your needs?	71%
3.	Will you be able to use the skills or knowledge presented in this activity in your assignment?	80%
4.	Do you feel that the things you learned through this activity will result in a greater sense of professional well-being?	90%
5.	Would you recommend this activity to others?	75%
6.	Would you recommend the consultants used for this activity?	92%

A one-day workshop for support personnel in the five magnet schools was held at the Education Service Center in October, 1981. The focus of the workshop was the role of the support person in the operation of an effective magnet school. The composite of responses from 49 participants follows.

		Yes Responses
1.	Was the activity informative and useful to you?	98%
2.	Was the activity successful in meeting your needs?	94%
3.	Will you be able to use the skills or knowledge presented in this activity in your assignment?	76%
4.	Do you feel that the things you learned through this activity will result in a greater sense of professional well-being?	100%
5.	Would you recommend this activity to others?	96%
6.	Would you recommend the consultants used for this activity?	84%

From August through December, there were seven building-level workshops for which evaluation forms were submitted.

Various activities were used to meet specific needs expressed in the individual buildings. Topics included school law, discipline, leadership, self image, multi-cultural education, classroom management and human relations. The composites for each of the seven building workshops follow.

	Yes Responses						
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
1. Was the activity informative and useful to you?	75%	88%	100%	100%	100%	82%	64%
2. Was the activity successful in meeting your needs?	38%	88%	86%	90%	100%	55%	55%
3. Will you able to use the skills or knowledge presented in this activity in your assignment?	66%	100%	93%	71%	100%	55%	55%
4. Do you feel that the things you learned through this activity will result in a greater sense of professional well-being?	71%	75%	93%	90%	100%	46%	64%
5. Would you recommend this activity to others?	46%	75%	100%	87%	100%	73%	27%
6. Would you recommend the consultants used for this activity?	79%	69%	100%	80%	87%	73%	73%

In March of 1982, the school teams met to plan individual school improvement programs for the 1982-83 school year. A three-day conference was held at a lake area conference center to enable participants to plan without interruptions from regular activities. Consultants at the conference presented topics in various areas to assist the planning teams. At the completion of the conference, each particpant responded to a survey of the activities. A composite of responses from 33 participants follows.

	Generally Agree
1. The focus and objectives of the conference were made clear to me.	97%
2. The consultants provided new ideas which will be included in our building staff development plan.	85%

	Generally Agree
3. I have a better understanding of the concept of an effective magnet school.	82%
4. I have a better understanding of my role in improving the effectiveness of the program in my building.	91%
5. I will be able to help other teachers in my building to gain a better understanding of the concept of an effective magnet school.	91%

Participants were asked to rate the effectiveness of the various components of the conference in providing information to develop their building staff development proposal. A composite of their ratings follows.

Component	Fully or Mostly Effective
1. Cultural awareness	76%
2. Parent involvement	73%
3. Characteristics of effective schools	85%
4. Extra curricular activities	61%
5. Planning and preparation of staff development proposals	64%

In late April of 1982, a final survey was sent to the 220 participants of the program. Survey items were designed to provide information about the involvement of the participants in the series of activities provided during the school year. A composite of responses from 67 participants follows.

	Generally Agree
1. The session held in August at the Education Service Center clarified the purpose and objectives of the magnet school.	57%
2. My input has been sought by my building planning team.	59%
3. My input has been utilized by my building planning team.	46%
4. My building planning team has kept me informed about the activities of this program.	48%

	Generally Agree
5. The building sessions have provided the means to improve the effectiveness of our magnet school program.	50%
6. I have a better understanding of my role in the magnet school because of this program of activities.	38%
7. My building planning team has reported to the staff about the staff development plans for next year prepared at the March conference.	36%
8. I believe that this program of activities will result in a more effective magnet school program in my building.	47%

Summary and Conclusions

Objective: To implement a program of staff development activities designed to provide magnet school personnel with more knowledge about the Plan for Further Desegregation and their role in providing equal educational opportunity.

This objective was generally achieved.

- Two one-day workshops, one three-day conference and a series of building-level workshops were conducted.
- Most participants reported that the activities were informative and useful.
- Thirty-eight percent of the participants responding to the final survey indicated that they had a better understanding of their role in the magnet school.

Recommendations

1. The Coordinator of Community Services/Human Relations for the Tulsa Public Schools should encourage the principals of the five schools to continue with the staff development proposals for the 1982-83 school year.
2. The elementary generalists should be involved with the school planning teams to provide assistance in the development of the proposals.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE
An Evaluation Report

Project Description

The Lau versus Nichols decision by the Supreme Court in January of 1974 prompted the Office of Civil Rights to establish a set of remedies to meet the educational needs of students whose home language is other than English. A 1975 study of compliance to Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 resulted in a 1977 requirement for the Tulsa Public Schools to develop a plan to provide for the needs of students whose home language is other than English. Using the set of remedies specified by the Office of Civil Rights, the Tulsa Public Schools developed the Language Minority Plan which was implemented during the 1977-78 school year.

Early in the 1977-78 school year, a teacher on special assignment was hired on a half-time basis to coordinate the program. The first activity was to survey all 58,000 students and, when necessary, their parents and teachers. Several translators were hired on an hourly basis to assist in the survey. The survey found 903 students in forty-eight different languages whose primary or home language was other than English, with Spanish being the most common, followed by Vietnamese. However, a greater proportion of the Vietnamese neded special help, and a significant number of Arabic-speaking students were also identified as being linguistically handicapped.

During the summer of 1978, three traveling teachers were hired and trained to teach English as a Second Language (ESL) in the elementary schools. Also, a teacher was designated in each of seventeen secondary schools to serve as the ESL specialist for that school. Interpreters were trained to give a language proficiency test to students of all ages and languages.

The program continued to operate according to the general framework of the plan through the 1980-81 school year. During the first semester of the 1981-82 school year, a modified plan was developed to decrease the size and increase the effectiveness of the English as a Second Language program.

The modified plan was implemented during the second semester of the 1981-82 school year. The main feature of the modified plan was the establishment of an English immersion center designed to serve ESL students from twenty-five elementary and eight junior high schools. The center was located in a wing of Byrd Junior High School and functioned as an independent program. The center operated with a staff of six techers on a daily schedule of 9:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. One teacher served as the program coordinator at the center and four aides were provided to assist with center activities. Children were transported from their home schools to the center and back to their home schools for regular classes in the afternoon.

Other components of the modified plan included ESL classes at two high schools, center teachers providing instruction for ESL students at five or six elementary and junior highs, and continuing the utilization of two ESL teachers on a full-time traveling basis for the remaining schools. At each of the two high schools, a foreign language teacher provided one period of in-school English instruction each day for ESL students.

Project Objective

To enable ESL students at the English immersion center to attain a higher level of English proficiency than that attained by all other ESL students.

Evaluation Procedures and Results

The achievement of the objective was evaluated by analyzing the results of the Individualized Developmental English Activities Oral Language Proficiency Test (IPT) which was administered to ESL students. The IPT manual describes the test as a process by which a student is required to respond to controlled stimuli, both verbal and visual. These responses are then assessed as to correctness, appropriateness and completeness. Criteria and protocol for assessment were provided in the Examiner's Manual. After the individual assessment had been made, a proficiency level rating of A through F was assigned to each student according to the number of items with acceptable responses among the 83 items on the test.

In the fall of 1981, 493 ESL students were identified in 39 elementary, 14 junior high and 8 senior high schools. There were 296 elementary and 197 secondary students eligible for the ESL program from the 61 schools. During the 1981-82 school year, 168 elementary and 87 secondary students were tested with the IPT. The center tested 85 elementary and 29 secondary students. Among the other students tested, there were 83 elementary and 60 secondary students served by the traveling teachers or through the in-school program. The results of the IPT testing follow.

Number Identified at Testing Levels

	Elementary		Secondary		
Level	Center	Traveling	Center	Traveling	In-School
A	1	1	0	0	0
B	5	11	3	4	2
C	16	34	3	18	6
D	36	21	16	18	1
E	17	9	3	1	0
F	10	7	4	9	1
Total	85	83	29	50	10

Percent Achieving Level D or Above

Elementary		Secondary	
Center	All Others	Center	All Others
74%	45%	79%	50%

Summary and Conclusions

The objective, "To enable ESL students at the English immersion center to attain a higher level of English proficiency than that attained by all other ESL students," was achieved.

Seventy-five percent of the center students achieved Level D or above while 47% of the students in other components of the ESL program achieved Level D or above.

Although the objective was achieved for those students tested, there were 236 children identified as ESL students who were not tested.

Another factor which may have affected the outcome was that the schools served by the center generally tended to be higher-achieving schools while the schools served by the traveling teachers generally tended to be lower-achieving schools. It may be that these learning environments had some impact on the achievement of the ESL students in both groups.

Recommendations

1. A full-time administrator should be assigned to the center to coordinate the program, conduct parent-community meetings, conduct staff development activities, coordinate testing and record keeping, and administer discipline.

2. Special consideration should be given to the qualifications and selection of the staff at the center. There is also a need for a reading specialist and at least one male staff member at the the center.

3. Staff development activities should be conducted to promote a better understanding of the program and to promote a more cooperative relationship between the center staff and the traveling teachers.

4. There is a need to improve communications among parents, the schools and the center concerning the operation of the program.

5. There is a need to survey the center staff to determine deficiencies in equipment and materials at the center.

6. Improvement in the parking area, custodial services, and other services for the center should be arranged through a cooperative agreement with the staff of Byrd Junior High School.

7. If an evaluation of the center is to be based upon achievement levels on the IPT, then students for the center should be representative of the total ESL population and all students identified as ESL should be tested.

FOOTSTEPS FOR FOURS
An Evaluation Report

Project Description

An early childhood development and parent involvement program, Footsteps for Fours, established at MacArthur Elementary School for the 1980-81 school year, was expanded to include Robertson Elementary School for the 1981-82 school year. Any child who lived in the district of the Tulsa Public Schools and was four years of age on or before September 1 was eligible for the program. Enrollment at each school was limited to forty children on a first come, first serve basis. Parents were to provide transportation or walking supervision for their children and be willing to participate in the parent involvement activities.

The program at Robertson was located in one room of an H-frame prefab building with restroom and drinking fountain facilities available in the building. A playground area was available near the building and included both grass and blacktop surfaces. A few items of standard playground equipment were located in the area and a sandplay activity was added.

The project staff at Robertson included one teacher and one aide. The teacher was an early childhood specialist and the aide had received training in early childhood education. The teacher and aide worked with twenty children in a morning group and twenty children in an afternoon group on Tuesday through Friday of each week. Parent involvement activities were held on alternate Fridays. The Instructional Assistant for Early Childhood Education assisted with the implementation of the program and the director of the Early Childhood Development Center served as a consultant.

The program was child-centered and based upon real learning experiences. The classroom was arranged with various interest centers utilizing multi-level materials and activities including sand, water, music, science, math and language. The children experienced learning through games, stories, music and rhythms, outdoor activities, guest speakers and field trips. They were introduced to skills of writing, reading and mathematics through the various activities in the interest centers. New foods were introduced through cooking experiences, tasting activities and a daily snack.

The parent participation component of the program included regular monthly meetings, individual parent conferences, a home visitation and serving as a volunteer helper. Volunteers spent a minimum of one day each semester in the classroom to help with such activities as screening of chidlren, implementing a special project, assisting with a field trip or working with a small group of children. A monthly bulletin with information about activities was given to each child to take home.

The program funding continued through an Early Childhood Development Grant from the Oklahoma State Department of Education.

Project Objectives

1. To implement a program of activities to develop responsibility, self-reliance, social attitudes, creativity and beginning cognitive skills in four-year-old children.
2. To implement a program of activities for parents to develop awareness of the total development of their chidlren and the value of educational opportunities through the home.

Evaluation Procedures and Results

Objective 1

The achievement of Objective 1 was evaluated by analyzing responses of the teacher and parents to questionnaire items concerning the program for the children at Robertson.

Teacher Questionnaire

The teacher was asked to reply to the question, "For each area of development, what changes have you observed that indicate to you that children generally have developed the desired skills?" The response for each area of development follows.

Responsibility

Putting things away, maintaining self control in groups and assuming responsibility of jobs.

Self-reliance

Making their own choices and working independently.

Social attitudes

Displaying good manners, taking turns, responding to emotions of others, and in responding to different situations on field trips.

Creativity

Feelings of accomplishment and success.

Beginning cognitive skills

Skills of recognizing numerals and names, calendar awareness, and verbalizing expressions.

Suggestions for improvement

We would like to have more parent, community and cultural involvement through combined activities with the children.

Parent Questionnaire

Part of the questionnaire for parents concerned items about the activities of their children. The composite of responses from 18 parents follows.

	Generally Agree
1. I am aware of my child developing more self-reliance.	100%
2. I think my child is developing more responsibility.	89%
3. My child is expressing new social attitudes.	100%
4. I think my child is becoming more creative.	100%
5. My child is developing new skills with letters or words.	100%
6. My child has expressed more interest in art or music.	94%
7. My child is developing new skills in using numbers or counting.	94%
8. I think this program has been a valuable experience for my child.	100%

Parents were asked to comment about the program. Some typical responses follow.

- I think the program is excellent. My child has improved in discipline and manners. She has expressed on several occasions how much she likes going to school.
- I think the program was an excellent educational experience for the children. I had the opportunity to help in the class on various occasions and could see each child developing new and better skills throughout the year.

- We feel that the program has been a valuable experience for our son. He seems better able to accept and work with others. We think this program has been beneficial in preparing him for the school years ahead. His teachers have been exceptional and he has been very impressed.

- The teachers have taken the kids to places lots of parents don't get a chance to take their kids.

Objective 2

The achievement of Objective 2 was evaluated by analyzing reponses of the teacher and parents at Robertson to items concerning the parent involvement activities.

Teacher Questionnaire

The teacher was asked to reply to the question, "For each activity, what statement would you make to generalize the response of parents to that activity?" The responses to the questions follow.

Group meetings

> The parent meetings were very successful because of the variety of meeting topics such as nutrition, development, game making, field trips and others with children participating. Also, attendance was very high.

Individual conference

> Individual conferences were well received and gave the parents opportunities to talk about their children.

Home visits

> Parents did not really understand why home visits were made and did not fully agree it was a valuable part of the program.

Monthly bulletins

> Newsletters provided helpful information about past and upcoming events.

Volunteer helper

> Parents enjoyed being helpers and felt that they were being useful.

Suggestion for improvement

We would like to be able to send activities home for child and parent participation.

Parent Questionnaire

Some of the questions for parents concerned the parent involvement component of the program. A composite of their responses follows.

		Generally Agree
1.	The group meetings have provided useful information about child development.	100%
2.	I have been informed about my child's development in a conference at school.	78%
3.	The home visit was a valuable part of the program.	50%
4.	The monthly bulletin provided me with sufficient information about activities.	100%
5.	Working with children as a volunteer helper was a valuable experience for me.	78%
6.	I think this program was a good experience for me.	100%

The teacher provided some observations about the responses from parents to various areas of the program.

- All parents were informed about conferences, but some did not attend a conference at school.
- The best time to make home visits would be just before school starts.
- Some of the parents did not understand the many ways they worked as volunteer helpers and stated they did not participate. They helped with transportation, going on field trips and with parties.

Summary and Conclusions

Objective 1: To implement a program of activities to develop responsibility, self-reliance, social attitudes, creativity and beginning cognitive skills in four-year-old children.

This objective was achieved.

- The teacher was able to state specific changes observed to demonstrate progress in each developmental area.

- Parents observed progress in all development areas with an average positive response of 97%.

Objective 2: To implement a program of activities for parents to develop awareness of the total development of their children and the value of educational opportunities through the home.

This objective was achieved.

- The teacher reported that responses to parent involvement activities were generally favorable.

- All of the parents who returned the survey reported that they gained useful information about child development.

Recommendation

The project staff should meet to discuss the needs of additional activities, materials and playground equipment.

IMPROVING SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS
An Evaluation Report

Project Description

Activities designed to improve school effectiveness were initiated during the 1981-82 school year in four target schools. Principals and teachers at Hawthorne, Houston, Lindsey and Post elementary schools participated in a series of individual building workshops to discuss the characteristics of effective teaching and to develop instructional objectives. The series of workshops was based on the transcript of the videotape presentation on teacher and school effectiveness produced by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). After viewing the videotape, teachers participated in discussions of the characteristics of schools which are effective in teaching basic skills. Instructional assistants served as workshop facilitators, discussion leaders and consultants for preparing instructional objectives.

Curriculum specialists in reading and mathematics worked with the elementary generalists to prepare workshops for developmental lessons in reading and mathematics. Other curriculum specialists prepared presentations to provide activities in art, music, drama and physical education designed to strengthen basic skills. Other workshop topics included test taking skills and time on task.

At the completion of the series of workshops, observation teams visited classrooms in the four target schools to determine the levels of effectiveness in specific areas identified as characteristics of effective teaching.

Project Objectives

1. To implement a program of staff development activities to improve teacher and school effectiveness.

2. To increase the rate of achievement in basic skills.

Evaluation Procedures and Results

Objective 1

The achievement of Objective 1 was evaluated by on-site visitations and a series of classroom observations in each school. A team of administrators and instructional assistants studied the various characteristics of effectiveness and periodically completed a classroom observation form.

Beginning in January, 1982, each of four observation teams spent one week in each of the target schools. At the end of four weeks, a composite of the observation forms was made for the first series of visitations. Appointments for the observations were made so that the teacher knew when an observer would be in the classroom. A second series of visitations was conducted with the observers visiting the classrooms without appointments. In many cases, the teachers did not know when an observer would be in the classroom. The composites for the two sets of visitations follow.

		Fully or Mostly Effective	
		Series I	Series II
1.	Lesson plans were prepared for the week.	72%	62%
2.	The lesson plan for this day was followed.	79%	63%
3.	A directed lesson which included presentation skills such as explaining, demonstrating and leading discussions was used with the group.	61%	55%
4.	Progress was monitored by asking questions and circulating through the room.	65%	59%
5.	Feedback was given to help students know what they have learned and what still needs to be learned.	61%	58%
6.	Students were on task by working on an academic assignment or listening to a presentation for an appropriate amount of time.	71%	64%
7.	The classroom climate was orderly as indicated by starting on time with teacher-directed activity and achievement orientation.	73%	67%
8.	There was greater reliance on praise than on criticism.	66%	62%
9.	Emphasis was placed upon the importance of learning and that everyone was expected to reach a certain level of skills acquisition.	53%	48%
	Composite	67%	60%

The visitations were discontinued at the close of the second series because the Plan of Action for the Priority Schools proposed in February of 1982 included the four target schools.

Objective 2

The achievement of Objective 2 was evaluated by analyzing the results of the April, 1981 and the April, 1982 SRA Achievement Series tests in reading and mathematics for grades three through six.

The target schools had been reported in the fall of 1981 as having the highest percent of students scoring at or below the twenty-fifth percentile rank on the April, 1981 SRA composite. The SRA composite is a weighted average of total reading, total mathematics and total language arts. The number and percent of students at or below the twenty-fifth percentile rank in reading and mathematics follow.

Students at 25th Percentile Rank or Below in Reading

1982 Grade	Number Tested	April 81	April 82	April 81	April 82
3	168	104	78	62%	46%
4	168	113	104	67%	62%
5	177	119	66	67%	37%
6	158	82	66	52%	42%
Composite	671	418	314	62%	47%

Students at 25th Percentile Rank or Below in Mathematics

1982 Grade	Number Tested	April 81	April 82	April 81	April 82
3	165	98	61	59%	37%
4	169	124	111	73%	66%
5	173	136	54	79%	31%
6	154	94	76	61%	49%
Composite	661	452	302	68%	46%

The progress of students in reading and mathematics was evaluated by analyzing the mean grade-equivalent scores for April, 1981 and April, 1982. Only those students with both scores were used in the study. Using the SRA Norms and Conversion Tables, an achievement rate was computed for each grade level. The achievement rate was defined as the observed gain divided by the expected gain. The expected mean grade-equivalent gain, expressed in months, was projected from the percentile rank of the April, 1981 grade equivalent. Normal progress is a 1.00 achievement rate.

The mean grade-equivalent scores, gains and achievement rates for reading and mathematics follow.

Reading

1982 Grade	N	Grade Equivalent April 81	April 82	Gain (Mos) Observed	Expected	Achievement Rate
3	168	1-8	2-7	+ 9	+ 5	1.80
4	168	2-0	2-7	+ 7	+ 2	3.50
5	177	2-4	4-3	+19	+ 3	6.33
6	158	3-6	5-1	+15	+ 9	1.67

Mathematics

1982 Grade	N	Grade Equivalent April 81	April 82	Gain (Mos) Observed	Expected	Achievement Rate
3	165	2-3	3-5	+12	+10	1.20
4	169	3-0	3-4	+ 4	+ 3	1.33
5	173	3-1	5-2	+21	+ 4	5.25
6	154	4-0	5-6	+16	+15	1.07

Summary and Conclusions

Objective 1: To implement a program of staff development activities to improve teacher and school effectiveness.

This objective was partially achieved.

- The series of workshops was conducted by the instructional assistants as designed.

- The series of visitations was terminated at the end of the second set. The composite of "fully or mostly effective" responses had dropped to 60% from the 67% recorded at the end of the first series.

- Many teachers had negative attitudes about the visitations and there was a general decline in morale over the duration of the program.

Objective 2: To increase the rate of achievement in basic skills.

The achievement of this objective could not be determined.

- The April, 1982 scores were unusually high in many instances, resulting in unrealistic achievement rates.

- Other programs, such as New Century reading, EPC reading management, developmental mathematics and Holt mathematics management were existing basic skills programs designed to improve achievement. These programs effects could not be distinguished from those introduced to improve school effectiveness.

Recommendations

1. The Tulsa Teacher Effectiveness Program should replace the program of visitations to observe characteristics of effective teaching.

2. If the program of visitations were to be conducted in other schools, then a guide should be prepared to enable observers to mark classroom checklists in the characteristics of effective teaching. This guide should contain specific components of each characteristic for the observer to identify as well as to what degree each component must be observed to mark the level of effectiveness. Workshops should be conducted for the observation teams to insure uniformity in the understanding of how to mark the checklists.

3. Standardized testing procedures in the target schools should be investigated. With the four target schools now among the thirteen in the Plan of Action for the Priority Schools, it is critical that uniform standardized testing procedures be followed.

LANGUAGE ARTS SKILLS INSTRUCTION
An Evaluation Report

Project Description

A basal English program for basic skills instruction in language arts was introduced as a pilot project at Eliot Elementary School during the 1981-82 school year. Four teachers of grades two through six used the program supplied by The Economy Company.

Expressways, a new basal language arts series for grades one through eight, provides a mastery learning system consisting of student texts, activity books, duplicating masters and competency skills tests. In addition, a resource book for teachers features a management system for the program. Other components of the program include large, color poster sets and student profile folders.

Project Objective

To increase achievement in language arts skills.

Evaluation Procedures and Results

To evaluate the impact of the program on achievement in language arts skills, a comparison group of students was selected from two other elementary schools which were similar to Eliot in terms of previous achievement, environment and school climate.

Analysis of covariance was used to equate the groups on control variables of total reading and total language arts scores on the April, 1981 SRA Achievement Series. The criterion variable was the April, 1982 SRA language arts score. Only those students with all three scores were used in the study. The adjusted mean grade-equivalent scores in language arts follow.

Grade	N	Comparison Students Grade Equivalent	N	Eliot Students Grade Equivalent
3	62	6-4	36	6-1
4	93	7-3	61	6-8
5	100	9-3	40	9-4
6	102	10-6	29	10-1

Summary and Conclusions

Objective: To increase achievement in language arts skills.

This objective was not achieved.

Generally, students in the comparison schools scored higher in language arts than did the Eliot students, but there were no significant differences in achievement.

Recommendations

1. A pilot project should not be conducted in one high-achieving school. It is difficult to measure significant gains in achievement for high-achieving students. A pilot project should include several schools with various levels of achievement.

2. Since the teachers seem to like the materials and are already using other Economy Company materials, there is no reason to change. Eliot school means in language arts are far above the national and district means, so there is no need for a program designed to increase skills in general. The program may help to identify individual students with deficiencies in language arts.

3. The elementary generalist and the instructional assistant for language arts should decide if it would be worthwhile to expand the study to include other schools to determine the impact on language arts achievement.

MULTI-SCHOOL LIBRARIANS
An Evaluation Report

Project Description

The Multi-School Librarian program was initiated in 1977 to provide library services to schools that had no established school library or no assigned librarian. The library services were provided by librarians scheduled through the Library Office at the Education Service Center.

During the 1981-82 school year, six librarians were assigned to serve eighteen elementary schools. The schools participating in the program were Addams, Barnard, Bates, Bunche, Celia Clinton, Cherokee, Chouteau, Columbus, Eugene Field, Franklin, Grimes, Jones, Kerr, Lee, MacArthur, Mayo, Park and Springdale.

The school principal was responsible for establishing a library program to best serve the needs of the school. The responsibilities of the librarian and the teachers were established and distributed by the Instructional Assistant for Resource Center/Libraries to librarians, teachers, aides, and other members of the school staff.

A multi-school librarian worked under the direction of the principals of the schools served. Each librarian was assigned to three schools and scheduled in each school one day per week. For the remaining two days of the week, the librarian's time was flexible to accommodate activities in the three assigned schools or at the Library Office. Friday afternoons were reserved for multi-school librarian meetings. When the librarian was not in a school, assigned staff members and aides carried out the library activities.

The multi-school librarian was responsible for spending at least one scheduled day per week organizing the Library Resource Center in each school. The librarian coordinated the selection of books and non-print materials and was responsible for supervising and helping with the processing of these materials. The librarian was available to teach library skills to students as well as to assist teachers with the use of materials in the Library Resource Center.

A media center aide was provided to assist each multi-school librarian with clerical work such as typing, filing and straightening shelves. The aide usually followed the same schedule as the librarian, but may have worked at the Library Office on some days.

Project Objectives

1. To organize books and non-book materials into a Library Resource Center with a procedure for processing these materials.

2. To provide a schedule of library activities designed to serve students in instruction in library skills, recreatory reading, and subject area enrichment and research.
3. To assist teachers in the use of materials in the Library Resource Center.
4. To establish a procedure for preview, evaluation and selection of books and non-print materials.

Evaluation Procedures and Results

The achievement of the objectives was evaluated by analyzing responses to checklists completed by principals and multi-school librarians, questionnaires completed by principals and teachers, and checklists completed during on-site evaluations.

Principal and Librarian Checklist

In October, principals of the schools being served by multi-school librarians completed a checklist to assess their current status in regards to the multi-school librarian program. The multi-school librarians serving these schools were also asked to respond to the same checklist for each of their schools. The responses of sixteen principals and librarians of seventeen schools are shown below.

	Yes Responses	
	Principals	Librarians
1. Have all book and non-book materials been accessioned in a centralized location and designated as Library Resource Center materials?	88%	41%
2. Are physical space and supplies in order for a check-out, check-in procedure for materials?	93%	82%
3. Are physical space and materials in order to accommodate students' working in the Library Resource Center?	88%	76%
4. Has a weekly schedule been established for Library Resource Center activities on days when the librarian is not in the building?	100%	65%
5. Does the schedule include an opportunity for teaching library skills?	100%	94%

	Yes Responses	
	Principals	Librarians
6. Does the schedule include an opportunity for recreatory reading?	94%	59%
7. Does the schedule include an opportunity for subject area enrichment and/or research?	69%	65%
8. Has the staff of your school been prepared for the Library Resource Center schedule and their participation?	81%	53%
9. Has the multi-school librarian been made to feel a part of your school by being introduced to the staff, informed of staff meetings and informed of building activities?	94%	71%
10. Has the librarian assumed her responsibilities?	82%	53%

Principal Survey

In February, principals of schools served by a multi-school librarian were asked to complete a questionnaire regarding the program in their schools. The responses of sixteen principals follow.

	Yes Responses
1. Has the collection of books been organized in a central location?	100%
2. Do you know the established procedure for checking out books?	100%
3. Have all non-book materials such as equipment, filmstrips, tapes, records and charts been organized in a central location?	81%
4. Do you know the established procedure for checking out non-book materials?	100%
5. Are the scheduled activities taking place in the library?	81%
6. Do your teachers take students to the library to check out books?	94%

		Yes Responses
7.	Are students checking out books from the library?	94%
8.	Are students able to check out books to read at home?	100%
9.	Have your teachers assigned students enrichment or research work to be done in the library?	94%
10.	Have your teachers given students instructions in library skills?	94%
11.	Has the librarian given students instructions in library skills?	100%
12.	Have your teachers made the librarian aware of special projects in their classes or the school so she can be of assistance?	88%
13.	Have your teachers had occasion to use some of the resource materials in the library this year?	88%
14.	Do you know how to request purchase of new materials for the library?	100%
15.	Have you been asked to preview, select or request new materials this year?	94%
16.	Have you requested new materials for the library this year?	82%
17.	Are students able to request new materials?	50%
18.	Do you think the Multi-School Librarian Program has been able to meet your school's library needs?	88%

Principals were also asked for any comments about the program. The comments indicated that the principals have been pleased with the way the program has served their schools and involved their teachers. Several of the principals, however, said that they would prefer having a full-time librarian.

Teacher Survey

In February, teachers of schools served by a multi-school librarian were asked to complete a questionnaire regarding the program in their schools. A composite of the responses of 180 teachers in the eighteen schools is shown below.

		Yes Responses
1.	Has the collection of books been organized in a central location?	97%
2.	Do you know the established procedure for checking out books?	85%
3.	Have all non-book materials such as equipment, filmstrips, tapes, records and charts been organized in a central location?	79%
4.	Do you know the established procedure for checking out non-book materials?	75%
5.	Are the scheduled activities taking place in the library?	82%
6.	Do you take students to the library to check out books?	62%
7.	Are your students checking out books from the library?	82%
8.	Are students able to check out books to read at home?	75%
9.	Have you assigned students enrichment or research work to be done in the library?	57%
10.	Have you given your students instructions in library skills?	59%
11.	Has the librarian given your students instructions in library skills?	74%
12.	Have you made the librarian aware of special projects in your class or school so she can be of assistance?	67%
13.	Have you had occasion to use some of the resource materials in the library this year?	87%
14.	Do you know how to request purchase of new materials for the library?	61%

		Yes Responses
15.	Have you been asked to preview, select or request new materials this year?	44%
16.	Have you requested new materials for the library this year?	33%
17.	Are your students able to request new materials?	28%
18.	Do you think the Multi-School Librarian Program has been able to meet your school's library needs?	66%

Teachers were asked to make comments about the program. The majority of comments praised the librarian and indicated appreciation for the services provided by the librarian. Many teachers requested that the time the librarian is in the school be increased to allow teachers to coordinate their activities with the librarian.

Observation Checklist

In February, a team of observers visited the schools being served by multi-school librarians. A composite of seventy-one responses to the observation checklist is shown below.

		Yes Responses
1.	Are books well organized in a central location?	96%
2.	Are non-book materials such as equipment, filmstrips, tapes, records and charts well organized in a central location?	66%
3.	Does the card catalog list the books in the library?	97%
4.	Does the card catalog or media catalog list non-book materials with a color-coded band on the card in the library?	55%
5.	Is there an established procedure in evidence for students and teachers to check out books?	73%
6.	Is there an established procedure in evidence for students and teachers to check out non-book materials?	48%
7.	Are the scheduled activities taking place?	51%

	Yes Responses
8. Are students in the library utilizing library materials during their scheduled time?	58%
9. Are bulletin boards or displays to motivate students visible?	87%

Observers were asked for the number of books checked out of the library during the previous week. Responses ranged from 0 to 300, with an average of 146.

Observers were also asked for comments about how the library was serving the school. Many of the comments indicated that the school schedule was non-existent or was not being met with consistency. The comments tended to indicate that most library activities were still the responsibility of the librarian to be conducted on the one day per week that the librarian was in the school.

Summary and Conclusions

Objective 1: To organize books and non-book materials into a Library Resource Center with a procedure for processing these materials.

This objective was partially achieved.

The books were organized into the Library Resource Center with an established procedure for processing the books. The non-book materials were not always located in the Library Resource Center with an established procedure for checking out. A discrepancy seems to exist between perceptions of principals, teachers, librarians, and the observation team regarding the treatment of non-book material.

Objective 2: To provide a schedule of library activities designed to serve students in instruction in library skills, recreatory reading, and subject area enrichment and research.

This objective was partially achieved.

Both teachers and the librarian have instructed students in library skills. Students have been checking out books in the schools through various methods for recreatory reading and subject area enrichment and research. A question did arise on the part of the evaluation team regarding whether the scheduled activities were taking place consistently. The schedules of the different schools showed a wide range of involvement and commitment required of the teachers.

Objective 3: To assist teachers in the use of materials in the Library Resource Center.

This objective was achieved.

Teachers reported that they know the established procedures for checking out books and materials. The teachers have alerted the librarian to upcoming projects for library assistance and have been utilizing the library resources.

Objective 4: To establish a procedure for preview, evaluation and selection of books and non-print materials.

This objective was achieved.

All principals reported that they knew the procedures to preview or request new materials. A smaller percentage of teachers responded that they were aware of the procedure. From the responses of principals and teachers, it was apparent that the procedure for preview, evaluation and selection of books and nonprint materials was known but not necessarily utilized by teachers and students.

Recommendations

1. Principals of schools requesting a multi-school librarian should sign a contract at the beginning of the school year outlining the specific responsibilities required of the school. The contract should state the specific requirements of the school schedules and outline the degree of teacher participation. One copy of the contract should remain with the principal for reference. Another copy should be sent to the Instructional Assistant for Resource Center/Libraries to assure that the principal is informed about the school's responsibilities for maintaining the program. A third copy should be sent to the Director of Elementary Education.

2. The librarian of the school should meet with the entire school staff in the fall of the year to briefly explain the intent of the program and the procedures for processing books and nonbook materials. At this time, the librarian can also explain the services provided for classroom teachers such as instruction in library skills, assisting in subject area enrichment and research and supplying new materials to supplement areas of classroom study.

3. The Library Resource Center should be located in a central location in the school. Library Resource Centers which are located in remote wings of the building should be moved into the hub of the school to allow easy access to all classrooms in the building.

4. Schools that fail to meet their responsibilities as outlined in the signed contract should be dropped from the program. This program cannot be effective unless the school staff shares in the responsibilities of maintaining a library program to serve the school.

MUSEUM STUDIES IN THE STUDIO ARTS
An Evaluation Report

Project Description

The Museum Studies in the Studio Arts program was a joint venture between the Tulsa Public Schools and Philbrook Art Center in which the public school curriculum included classes at Philbrook. The program was financed by grants from Dayton Hudson Foundation, Philbrook Art Center, the State Arts Council of Oklahoma and $3,000 from the Tulsa Public Schools. The participants were fifth and sixth grade students identified as academically gifted or recommended by their art teachers as especially talented in the studio arts.

The public school teachers accompanied their students to the classes at Philbrook and participated in all class activities with the students. The sessions were limited to forty-four students and were scheduled for twenty half days from 9:30-11:30 a.m.

The museum collections studied were African, American and Western European Renaissance, Native American, and Oriental. After exposure to the technical, cultural and social aspects of those art collections, the students used creative and analytical skills to design a studio art project based upon some aspect of the museum collection. Students selected one of four studio art areas in which gallery and studio resources were integrated. The studio art areas offered were ceramics, enameling and copper etching, photography and print making.

Through the study and making of art based on museum collections, students had an opportunity to develop skills which enabled them to use museum resources to increase sensitivity to visual design and to manipulate a technical art process to achieve a work of art.

Project Objectives

1. To provide a program of art studies to challenge the abilities and meet the needs of gifted and talented students.

2. To provide gifted and talented students an opportunity to produce an original work of art based on their art studies in a museum/studio environment.

Evaluation Procedures and Results

The achievement of the objectives was evaluated by analyzing responses from students, parents, teachers and museum staff to questionnaires concerning the museum studies program. In addition, a team of educators served as on-site evaluators of the program.

Student Questionnaire

All students who participated in the February-March session of the museum studies program were asked to respond to questions about their experience. A composite of the responses from thirty-eight students follows.

	Yes Responses
1. Do you think that you learned something new about art by going to Philbrook?	97%
2. Did you enjoy making art projects?	100%
3. Did you enjoy working with students and teachers from other schools?	81%
4. Did you have any trouble doing the school work you missed while at Philbrook?	16%

Students were asked what they liked best about the Philbrook art program. Most of the responses expressed enjoyment of being able to learn something new about art through the tours in the museum or through art instruction in the classroom. Also mentioned favorably were social contacts with students from other schools and teachers of the classes. Many responses focused on the actual process of creating an art project.

Students were also asked what they didn't like about the Philbrook art program. The most-mentioned response to this question was that students did not like missing their classes at school. Also mentioned several times was the bus ride to the museum.

Parent Questionnaire

Parents of students who participated in the February-March session of the museum studies program were asked to respond to questions about their children's experience. A composite of the responses from thirty-four parents follows.

	Yes Responses
1. Has your child talked about or expressed enjoyment of the Museum Studies in the Studio Arts Program?	100%
2. Did your child spend any time outside of school in activities related to his studies at the museum?	20%
3. Do you feel that it is valuable to receive art instruction in a museum studio setting?	97%

	Yes Responses
4. Were you satisfied with the art project produced by your child in this program?	74%
5. Do you feel that this was a valuable experience for your child?	100%
6. Would you recommend this program for other gifted and talented students?	100%
7. Did your child have any difficulty keeping abreast of classwork missed while participating in this program?	12%

Parents were asked if they observed any changes in behavior or attitude in their children as a result of this program. Responses to this question indicated that students were enthusiastic about the program and developed an appreciation of the arts. Many parents reported that their children developed a new interest in art.

Parents were asked to make specific suggestions for program changes. The responses to this question were varied. One parent wanted more time spent learning about the museum and the art displayed there. Another parent thought a month was too long and wanted the session shortened.

Comments about the museum studies program made by parents indicated that they appreciated the opportunity for their children to participate in the program and felt that their children benefited from the experience. Some parents, however, questioned how the museum program met the goals established for gifted students.

Teacher Questionnaire

The three Tulsa Public School teachers who participated in the February-March session of the museum studies program completed a questionnaire about their experience. A composite of their responses follows.

	Yes Responses
1. Were you given enough information in advance to prepare the students for the project?	100%
2. Did other staff members in your school seem supportive of the program?	33%

		Yes Responses
3.	Was the information presented on museum tours suitable for gifted/talented students?	67%
4.	Did the students seem to enjoy the museum tours?	67%
5.	Was the art instruction suitable for gifted/talented students?	100%
6.	Did the students seem to enjoy the art instruction?	100%
7.	Were the studio art projects suitable for gifted/talented students?	100%
8.	Did the art projects reflect what students had learned in the museum lectures?	100%
9.	Did the students show evidence of task commitment during studio work?	100%
10.	Did each student in your class produce at least one work of art?	100%
11.	Did you observe evidence of students working cooperatively during the art projects?	100%
12.	Did you observe evidence of socialization between students of different schools?	100%
13.	In your opinion, was the art work produced by students compatible with the abilities of gifted/talented students?	100%
14.	In your opinion, did the overall program challenge the abilities and meet the needs of gifted/talented students?	100%
15.	Did you discover something about a student in this setting that you would like to pursue in your classroom?	34%

The teachers' comments reflected an appreciation of the program and the quality of the instruction offered. The question was raised about the length of the session with one suggestion that the session might be broken into two two-week studies in two classes with a break in between.

Museum Staff Questionnaire

The staff members of Philbrook Art Center were asked to respond to questions concerning the museum studies program at the end of the February-March session. A composite of the responses from seven staff members follows.

	Yes Responses
1. Did the students in this program meet your expectations of gifted and talented students?	86%
2. Were you able to present material to these students at a level beyond that of a regular class?	100%
3. Were the students attentive during the classroom instruction?	100%
4. Did the students produce art projects that lived up to your expectations of gifted and talented students?	86%
5. Did the art projects reflect what the students had learned in the museum lectures?	86%
6. Did each student in your class produce at least one work of art?	100%
7. Did the cooperative relationship with the Tulsa Public Schools and their staff prove to be an agreeable arrangement?	86%
8. Did you find the participation of the classroom teachers helpful?	86%
9. Would you recommend that this program be continued?	100%

Staff members were requested to recommend changes and make comments about the program. Most of the comments reflected pleasure with the program as established and the results of the students' work. One suggestion for improvement was that students be required to keep a diary of their tours, projects and general experiences at Philbrook. This idea was suggested as a means of giving students an incentive to excel as well as to retain information to apply to their projects.

On-Site Observation Checklist

Thirteen educators from the Tulsa Public Schools were asked to serve on an evaluation team for the museum studies program. The team members visited the museum on a flexible schedule at the beginning, middle and end of the session to observe and evaluate the development of the instructional process. A composite of the responses from the observation team follows.

		Yes Responses
1.	Were adequate facilities, equipment and materials provided for the students?	93%
2.	Were the students divided into groups small enough to receive individual attention when necessary?	100%
3.	Did the Tulsa Public School teachers participate in the learning with their students?	97%
4.	Did the instructors appear knowledgeable about their area of instruction?	93%
5.	Did the instructors appear to communicate well with the pupils?	93%
6.	Did the pupils seem to be interested in the topics of the presentation?	97%
7.	Did the material presented seem suitable and challenging to gifted/talented students?	77%
8.	Did the students appear to be challenged to complete the studio art projects?	73%
9.	Did the task commitment of students meet your expectations of gifted/talented students?	70%
10.	Did the resulting art work meet your expectations of gifted/talented students?	66%
11.	In your opinion, did the overall program challenge the abilities and meet the needs of gifted/talented students?	70%

Suggestions for improving the program made by the evaluation team included suggestions that students be encouraged to do more original and experimental work. One class had no Tulsa Public School teacher in attendance, and the team recommended that one teacher be assigned to each art class to assist the museum staff instructor. One suggestion was to relieve students of their classwork during attendance and another suggestion was that the program be conducted in the summer so that students would not miss four weeks of classwork.

Members of the evaluation team were also asked to make comments about the program. Although most comments were in praise of the program, several responses questioned the program as challenging gifted students. Some evaluation team members saw the program as an enrichment program which could serve all students. The question was raised about whether copying design elements of museum collections is as creative as producing a new work based upon what was learned about past cultures and processes.

Some members questioned the length of the session both in terms of time needed to work in one art medium and in terms of time away from the regular school classes. The concern was expressed that the time away from classes would produce resentment on the part of teachers for these students.

Summary and Conclusions

Objective 1: To provide a program of art studies to challenge the abilities and meet the needs of gifted and talented students.

This objective was achieved.

Students and parents reported unanimously that the program was an enjoyable and valuable experience. All of the teachers reported that the program challenged the abilities and met the needs of gifted and talented students. The observation team also reported approval of the program for gifted and talented students.

Objective 2: To provide gifted and talented students an opportunity to produce an original work of art based on their art studies in a museum/studio environment.

This objective was achieved.

The parents, teachers, museum staff and observation team reported satisfaction with the art work produced by the students involved in the program. Students reported that the most enjoyable part of the museum studies program was being able to learn something new about art through the tours in the museum or through art instruction in the classroom.

Recommendations

1. The Museum Studies in the Studio Arts program should be continued as part of the program provided for gifted students in Tulsa Public Schools.

2. The museum staff and public school staff should investigate the possibility of modifying the present four-week schedule for the museum studies program to reduce the program to a three-week session in one art medium or two two-week sessions in two art mediums.

3. The Tulsa Public School teachers should incorporate studies on the history and culture of the Oriental, African, American Indian and American and European Renaissance into the curriculum for the gifted students. These studies would provide a background or a follow-up for the museum studies program.

4. The teachers participating in the program should consider the suggestion which was made about students keeping a journal of tour information and art instruction. This activity would complement the academic thrust of the gifted and talented program as well as provide opportunities for students to practice research and study skills.

5. A procedure should be established by the museum and made known to the Tulsa Public Schools for identifying school personnel and parents wishing to observe the operation of Museum Studies in the Studio Arts program.

PHILHARMONIC YOUTH CONCERT
An Evaluation Report

Program Description

For the past thirty years, the Philharmonic Youth Concert has been providing fifth and sixth-grade students an opportunity to attend a symphony concert in its regular environment. A different program has been planned each year for the performance. All elementary and middle schools in the Tulsa Public School System have been invited to participate free of charge. The Tulsa Philharmonic Society has contributed the cost of the concert and the Tulsa Public Schools has furnished bus transportation for the students. Several other schools from the surrounding area also attended these performances under similar arrangements.

During the 1981-82 school year, four performances were held in October, accommodating approximately 7,500 students from the Tulsa Public Schools. The program was titled "Invitation to the Dance" and contained seven works, all of which were related to dance music. Preceding each selection, Joel Lazar, the conductor, prepared the students to look for the basic rhythm pattern and repetition found in each number. In addition to affording students an opportunity to hear a symphony orchestra, the concert allowed students an occasion to visit the Performing Arts Center to gain awareness of civic facilities in Tulsa.

Program Objectives

1. To provide students an aesthetic experience of hearing a symphony concert in its regular environment.
2. To provide students an opportunity to enjoy a performance in the Performing Arts Center.

Evaluation Procedures and Results

The achievement of the objectives was evaluated by analyzing the results of questionnaires sent to students and teachers who attended the performance. The questionnaires were sent a few days after the program in October.

Teacher Questionnaire

All teachers who attended the program with their classes were asked to respond to various questions about the program. Some principals attended and were also asked to respond. A composite of 213 teacher and principal responses follows.

	Yes Responses
1. Were the arrangements for transportation to and from the Performing Arts Center satisfactory?	81%
2. Were the arrangements for getting to your seats and back to the buses satisfactory?	91%
3. Did most of your students like attending a program at the Performing Arts Center?	94%
4. Was the program appropriate for most of your students?	93%
5. Did most of your students enjoy the music?	90%
6. Did the program hold the attention of most of your students?	90%
7. Was this program a valuable aesthetic experience for most of your students?	93%
8. Do you think this program should be continued?	95%
9. Have you ever attended a regular Philharmonic concert?	78%

Teachers and principals were also asked to make comments about the program. Most of the comments about the program were favorable. The teachers felt that the program provided an enjoyable, educational opportunity for their students. Unfavorable comments concerned the misconduct of students and inadequate space provided on the buses.

Student Questionnaire

A sample of students was asked to respond to questions about the program and the experience of attending a concert. Responses from 1,618 fifth and 1,183 sixth graders follow.

	Yes Responses	
	Gr. 5	Gr. 6
1. Did you enjoy going to the Performing Arts Center for the concert?	95%	93%
2. Did you enjoy most of the music in the concert?	90%	86%
3. Would you like to go to another concert?	93%	90%
4. Have you ever gone to a concert like this that wasn't a school program?	18%	27%

Students were asked what they liked best and what they did not like about the program. Most students liked all of the program with many references to specific musical selections. Disruptive behavior of other students was the dislike most often reported.

Summary and Conclusions

Objective 1: To provide students an aesthetic experience of hearing a symphony concert in its regular environment.

This objective was achieved.

The responses of the teachers, administrators and pupils to the entire concert experience were positive. Ninety-three percent of teachers and administrators responded that the program was a valuable aesthetic experience for most of their students. The students responded that they enjoyed the music and would like to go to another concert.

In addition, several teachers and administrators commented that for some students this would be the only opportunity to attend a symphony concert. This fact was borne out by reponses on the student questionnaire. When asked whether they had ever gone to a concert like this, only 18% of fifth graders and 27% of sixth graders reported that they had ever attended a concert. Teacher responses to the same question indicated that 78% of the teachers had attended a regular Philharmonic concert.

Although individual tastes for music were evident, teachers, administrators and student responses indicated that the students enjoyed the music performed. The number of student comments referring to specific titles, kinds of music or specific instruments indicated that students learned from the experience of attending a concert.

Objective 2: To provide students an opportunity to enjoy a performance in the Performing Arts Center.

This objective was achieved.

Teachers, administrators and students reported positively to attending a performance in the Performing Arts Center. Despite some difficulty with bus transportation, 9[illegible]% of teachers and administrators responded that students enjoyed an opportunity to attend a performance at the Performing Arts Center. Although a few students commented on having to climb stairs, 95% of fifth graders and 93% of sixth graders reported enjoying going to the Performing Arts Center.

Recommendations

1. The overwhelming response to the enjoyment of this experience indicates that it is a worthwhile program for fifth and sixth graders which should be continued.

2. The comments of students indicating specific song titles and types of music indicates that this is a worthwhile learning activity for fifth and sixth graders which should be continued.

3. Teachers appreciated the information provided regarding the concert so that they could prepare their students for attendance. This practice should be continued so that students have an opportunity to become familiar with the selections they will hear.

4. The number of responses from teachers and students referring to misconduct in the front rows of the balconies indicates that special supervision needs to be maintained in these areas so as not to interfere with the enjoyment of the concert. Perhaps more adult supervision should be required. These concerns should also be communicated to other school districts in attendance.

5. In some areas, bus transportation seems to have been inadequate for the number of students attending from some schools. The number of students attending from each school should be determined in advance so that proper bus transportation can be provided.

SPANISH IMMERSION
An Evaluation Report

Project Description

The United States is moving to strengthen its governmental and business influence around the world. As this occurs, Americans who speak languages in addition to English are in a position to gain both professional and personal advantages. Preparing students for these advantages is a major goal of the Spanish immersion program.

Spanish immersion has been developed as a program in which Spanish is used as the language of instruction for native English-speaking children. The program is different from the traditional approaches in which a foreign language is taught as a separate subject. Spanish is used in all classroom instruction and conversation. The children learn to speak Spanish naturally, hearing it constantly and using it for normal activities. After five or six years in this program, children speak, read and write in both Spanish and English.

In the United States, the first immersion program for native English-speaking children began in 1971 at Culver City, California in Spanish. Since then, three others have been established in Spanish. Additionally, two programs in French and one in German have been implemented. Research studies have shown that as children progress through the program there is no loss of achievement in subject matter. Greater intellectual flexibility and greater cultural understanding have been reported as results of early language immersion.

An elementary immersion program beginning in kindergarten provides 100% second language instruction in the first two years and 60% to 80% in years three and four. After second language fluency is achieved, it is used as the teaching medium for 50% of instruction time and the remaining 50% is given in English. This instructional balance, along with home use of the English language, is sufficient for children to become functional in both languages.

The Instructional Assistant for Foreign Language for the Tulsa Public Schools, with the assistance of language immersion consultants, established a program steering committee and developed an extended-day kindergarten Spanish immersion class for twenty-nine children. Any child who lived in the district of the Tulsa Public Schools and was five years of age on or before September 1, 1981 was eligible for the program. Applications for the program were taken in April, 1981 and screened by the steering committee. The program was implemented in the fall of 1981 at Eliot Elementary School in addition to the regular kindergarten program. The Instructional Assistant for Early Childhood Education served on the steering committee and assisted in the screening of the children and the planning of the extended-day program.

The program staff consisted of a native Spanish-speaking teacher and a classroom aide who was a native Spanish speaker. The teacher had previous experience in kindergarten with Spanish-speaking children.

Kindergarten equipment and materials have been provided to meet the needs of instruction in Spanish.

Project Objective

To implement a program to prepare students to speak, read and write in both Spanish and English.

Evaluation Procedures and Results

The achievement of the objective was evaluated by administering questionnaires to the steering committee and to parents of children in the program. Achievement in language development was evaluated by analyzing the results of the Basic Inventory of Natural Language test and the Reading Pre-Book Skills Inventory.

In February, 1982 the advisory committee members were asked to visit the classroom and complete a questionnaire concerning their committee participation and the implementation of the program. The composite of responses from six members follows.

Advisory Committee Participation	Yes Responses
1. Have you been satisfied with your involvement in the planning and development of the program?	100%
2. Have you felt free to make comments or suggestions about the program?	100%
3. Do you think the committee has been well-informed about the program by the project staff?	83%
4. Generally, do you think the committee has functined as intended according to your understanding of the program objectives?	100%

Program Implementation	Yes Responses
1. Do you think the room is adequate for the program?	0%
2. Was the room decorated and arranged appropriately?	100%

	Yes Responses
3. Did you see the teacher functioning as you expected?	100%
4. Did you see the aide functioning as you expected?	100%
5. Were the children involved in the types of activities you expected to see?	100%
6. Were the children understanding and using as many Spanish words as you expected?	100%
7. Generally, do you think the program is being implemented as designed?	100%

Parent meetings were held on a regular basis to provide information about the program and answer questions. Previous to the May, 1982 meeting, questionnaires were mailed with instructions to bring them to the meeting for the final information session. A composite of responses from 21 parents follows.

	Generally Agree
1. The application and interview process provided me with adequate information to make a decision about placement of my child in the program.	100%
2. The program staff has kept me informed about the activities of the program.	85%
3. I have felt free to ask questions about the program or to visit the class.	80%
4. School has been a happy experience for my child.	90%
5. My child has demonstrated satisfactory growth socially, physically and intellectually.	95%
6. I want my child to continue in this program.	90%

Parents were also asked to express their opinions about the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The quality of the staff was the most often mentioned strength of the program, while the classroom size and teacher/pupil ratio were the greatest weaknesses reported. All parent comments were summarized and reported to the steering committee.

In the first year of instruction, the main objective was to achieve Spanish comprehension. In May, 1982, the teacher administered the Basic Inventory of Natural Language test to each child to determine the proficiency level of Spanish.

The Basic Inventory of Natural Language (BINL) is a complete criterion referenced system designed to assess the language dominance, proficiency, and growth of students in school language arts and reading programs. It has been found to be particularly suited to bilingual programs and programs dealing with dialects and language development.

The BINL may be used to assess proficiency, which is the degree of command of a particular language or dialect that a child possesses. Proficiency in a language is defined as the ability to use the various components of language such as vocabulary, structure and morphology to express thoughts.

The BINL provides a series of scores which become the language profile of each student. One of the scores of the profile is that of fluency, which is the total number of words used by the student during the sampling. This score is a general indicator of ability to use the vocabulary, structures and forms of a language. A second score that results from the BINL is level of complexity, which indicates command of the structures of the language, including the use of modifiers, phrases and clauses. The BINL also separates each of these measures so that they may be considered separately on the student profile. A third score is that of average sentence length, which is derived as a function of the fluency count and the number of phrases or sentences used by the student.

The BINL Instructions Manual provided norms for average sentence length and the complexity level, but no norms for the fluency scores.

The average sentence length ranges between 0 and 15 words. For the 27 children in the program, the average sentence length was 6 words. The range for the class was from 3.7 to 8.1 words. No norms were available to indicate the expectancy for kindergarten children.

A sample of 9,795 kindergarten children was used to determine the norms for the complexity level. The norms and the results for 27 children in the program follow.

	Norm	Local
Minimum complexity level	2.0	1.0
Maximum complexity level	200.0	46.1
Average complexity level	43.2	35.2
Standard deviation	28.2	9.0

The average fluency score for the 27 children was 74. The scores ranged from 19 to 108 in fluency.

Results reported from a similar program in San Diego, California followed the progress of 75 kindergarten children in each of three years. Their results follow.

Year	Average Complexity Level
1979	43.2
1980	45.8
1981	57.5

In order to evaluate the children in terms of the traditional kindergarten program, the teacher marked the Reading Pre-Book Skills Inventory. The Inventory identifies 63 skills areas to be included in the instructional program. The Inventory was marked during the fourth quarter and each child was marked as having mastered all 63 skills.

Summary and Conclusions

Objective: To implement a program to prepare students to speak, read and write in both Spanish and English.

The objective was generally achieved.

- According to steering committee members and parents, the program was implemented and operated as designed.
- The average complexity level achieved on the BINL was below the norm for kindergarten children. The small group of children in this program appears to be more homogenous than the group of children used in the norming sample. The range and standard deviation were much smaller for the local group than in the norming sample.
- The scoring of the test is subjective in nature, with the teacher listening to a tape recording and making a judgment based upon criteria provided in the Instructions Manual. However, there may be variations among teachers in the scoring of the children. It may be that the San Diego teachers are becoming more flexible in their scoring, since their 1981 results for kindergarten are near the norm for second graders.

Recommendations

1. The steering committee should continue its effort to locate teachers for the program. Native Spanish-speaking teachers are critical to the continuation of the program and special efforts should be made to attract teachers to this program.

2. The elementary generalist should provide assistance for the first grade teacher to insure continuity in the program. The kindergarten teacher and the kindergarten instructional assistant should also work closely with the first grade teaching staff.

3. Classroom facilities and materials should be studied to determine what improvements can be made to meet the requirements of the program.

4. The Instructions Manual for the Basic Inventory of Natural Language should be reviewed in the area of the procedures for taking the samples of tape recordings of oral language and in the scoring of the tapes. The teacher may have set higher standards than are required in the instructions or were used by the San Diego teachers.

PART II: Progress Reports

BASIC READING LEARNING CENTERS
A Progress Report

Project Description

For the 1981-82 school year, Basic Reading Learning Centers continued to serve students at Addams, Alcott, Bryant, Burroughs, Cherokee, Eugene Field, Frost, Greeley, Hawthorne, Houston, Jackson, Lindsey, Penn, Post, Remington, Riley, Roosevelt, Sequoyah, Springdale and Woods elementary schools. Twenty teachers and twenty-four aides provided basic reading skills activities for students in 140 classes. With the guideline for eligibility set at the thirty-fifth percentile rank or below in reading achievement, the program served 2,142 students in grades three through six.

The centers offered a different approach to reading in methodology as well as in curriculum. A center contained from twelve to twenty-two station carrels. Each station served one pupil and had an electrical outlet, a power cord, a self-stop audio-playback unit and a pupil headset. A headset which could be plugged into any of the pupil units was provided for the teacher. The curriculum was designed to offer the pupil an individualized, diagnostic, prescriptive, continuous progress reading program. Programmed reading instruction was presented through the use of a cassette playback unit and a wide spectrum of related learning materials. The reading program was a comprehensive, complete reading system which included word attack skills, vocabulary, reading and auditory comprehension, and study skills. The equipment and materials were supplied by the New Century Education Corporation.

Project Objective

To enable students in reading center classes to attain a higher achievement rate than the mean achievement rate of under-achievers in regular reading classes.

Progress in Reading Achievement

As a comparison group for the reading center students, those students who scored at or below the thirty-fifth percentile rank in total reading on the April, 1981 SRA Achievement Series and were in regular reading classes in the 47 elementary schools which did not have reading center classes were selected. Only those students who had April, 1981 and April, 1982 SRA scores were used.

Using the SRA Norms and Conversion Tables, an achievement rate was computed for each grade and the composite of students. The achievement rate was defined as the observed gain divided by the expected gain. The expected mean grade-equivalent gain, expressed in months, was projected from the percentile rank of the April, 1981 grade equivalent. Normal progress is a 1.00 achievement rate.

The mean grade-equivalent scores, gains and achievement rates for the reading center classes and the regular reading classes follow.

Underachievers in Basic Reading Centers

1982 Grade	N	Grade Equivalent		Gain (Mos)		Achievement Rate
		April 81	April 82	Observed	Expected	
3	406	1-6	2-3	+ 7	+ 5	1.40
4	426	1-9	2-6	+ 7	+ 2	3.50
5	410	2-2	3-9	+17	+ 3	5.67
6	305	2-9	4-5	+16	+10	1.60
Composite	1547	2-1	3-3	+12	+ 3	4.00

Underachievers in Regular Reading Classes

1982 Grade	N	Grade Equivalent		Gain (Mos)		Achievement Rate
		April 81	April 82	Observed	Expected	
3	326	1-8	2-6	+ 8	+ 5	1.60
4	336	2-2	3-1	+ 9	+ 5	1.80
5	328	2-6	4-3	+17	+ 4	4.25
6	208	3-4	4-4	+10	+11	0.91
Composite	1198	2-1	3-2	+11	+ 3	3.70

Among the 20 schools with reading centers and the 47 schools without centers, there were various basal series and instruction materials used. In particular, 8 of the schools with centers and 15 of the schools without centers used the EPC Reading Management System. Generally, it appears that the variety of instructional materials would have equal impact on the achievement of underachievers in either group of schools.

Other factors which may have had an impact on achievement were the teacher effectiveness training conducted for teachers in some schools in both groups and the school effectiveness pilot project in four target schools. If the scores of the 440 reading center students in the four target schools were taken from the scores of the 1,547 students reported, the observed mean gain would be one month greater.

In addition, it appears that the SRA achievement scores for April, 1982 are inconsistent in some schools at various grade levels. Generally, the inconsistencies appear to be evenly distributed between the two groups of schools.

Summary and Conclusions

It is assumed that the variety of instructional materials, staff development activities and the inconsistencies in SRA scores may have had equal impact on the achievement in both groups of students. Therefore, it may be assumed that the differences in achievement are results of the programs in reading.

Generally, the objective was achieved. The underachievers in reading center classes gained 12 months while the underachievers in regular reading classes gained 11 months.

CAREER EDUCATION FOR LIFE'S SAKE
A Progress Report

Project Description

Career Education for Life's Sake, developed during the 1978-79 school year, was originally designed as a three-year pilot project proposed by the Junior League of Tulsa, Inc., to infuse career education into the Tulsa Public Schools. Teachers at Grimes, Marshall and McClure elementaries, Nimitz junior high and Memorial senior high were offered supplementary materials and volunteer assistance in all areas of the curriculum as needed and requested. Because of additional funds secured from federal resources, teachers at Chouteau, Mark Twain and Riley elementaries, Madison middle and Central senior high schools were selected to receive materials and be offered staff development activities in career education during the second semester of the 1980-81 school year. With continued interest in the expansion of career education services, the Junior League agreed to sponsor the project for a fourth year.

The support and funding for the career education project for 1981-82 was shared by the Junior League and the Tulsa Public Schools. The Junior League provided twelve volunteers and $21,250 for expenditures which included part of the salary for a career education specialist, audiovisual and printed materials, workshops, and the writing of an elementary curriculum guide. The Tulsa Public Schools provided office and meeting facilities, clerical assistance, and $21,650 for expenditures such as part of the salary for the career education specialist and program materials. A steering committee, composed of personnel of the Tulsa Public Schools, representatives of the business community and the Junior League, was responsible for giving direction, determining policies and insuring that high project standards be maintained through adequate staffing and good personnel practices.

The career education specialist worked with League volunteers, education directors, instructional assistants, principals and teachers to coordinate the infusion of career education into the curriculum. The volunteers worked directly with principals, teachers, small groups of students and PTA groups.

Project Objective

To increase awareness in the Tulsa community and the Tulsa Public Schools of the concept and value of career education.

Progress in Promoting Community Awareness

The career education specialist promoted awareness in the business community through appearances at meetings of the Downtown Rotary Club and the Oil Capitol Chamber of Commerce during the fall of 1981. The Career Education for Life's Sake media presentation was included in the program. Careers Sandwiched In was a joint project of the Tulsa Public Schools and the Metropolitan Tulsa Chamber of Commerce designed to provide career awareness during the lunch hour at Central High School.

To promote awareness in the academic community the career education specialist spoke to groups in faculty meetings, principal meetings, instructional assistant meetings and department meetings. Education related groups such as the PTA City Council, numerous PTA Executive Boards, and PTA unit meetings scheduled the career education specialist as a speaker to promote awareness.

The Career Education Newsletter continued to provide information for Tulsa Public School personnel through six issues which featured career education activities in the various schools.

Other school systems and the Junior League of Area V were informed about the progress of Career Education for Life's Sake at the one-day career education conference held at the Williams Plaza Hotel in Tulsa in May, 1982. The conference was a culminating activity of the project and attracted over two hundred participants from five states. Participants of the conference were asked to rate the effectiveness of each session of the workshop. Ratings were on a scale of 0, not at all effective, to 5, effective to a great extent. A composite of responses from 166 participants follows.

		Rating 4 or 5
1.	The objectives of this session were clearly presented.	90%
2.	The presenters were well prepared for this session.	97%
3.	This session provided me with information that I can use in my own situation.	84%
4.	This session provided me with the information I needed on this topic.	86%
5.	This session sustained my interest.	91%
6.	I would recommend this session to others.	91%
7.	I would recommend the presenters for other workshops.	95%

Progress in Curriculum Infusion

For the 1981-82 school year, the focus of the in-schools program was to infuse career education into the curriculum of all schools. League volunteers assisted with the infusion by producing and distributing an elementary curriculum guide, by providing in-school services in a career awareness project, and by sponsoring various workshops for the academic and business communities. To further expand services to all schools, the career education specialist was available to all teachers on a request basis.

A team of teachers was hired during the summer of 1981 to write curriculum for the career education guide. The team worked with the career education specialist to design activities to infuse career education into the curriculum. League volunteers provided assistance with materials, proofreading, editing and other production tasks.

Consultants from I(t) Work(s) of Denton, Texas provided a workshop in September, 1981 to demonstrate how career education can be infused into any classroom using existing materials and resources in all curricular areas.

In a pilot project to infuse career education into the curriculum, resources were made available to teachers through an October workshop which introduced the Career Awareness Program (CAP). Teachers from Cherokee, Columbus, Cooper, Key, Lindsey, Mark Twain, Peary, Phillips, Robertson and Wright elementary schools attended a one-day workshop to prepare them to use the self-awareness and career awareness program with kindergarten through sixth grade children. CAP has been designed to infuse career education into the basic curriculum without altering lesson plans. Each unit features one occupation used to reinforce academic skills already being taught. A follow-up workshop was held in February, 1982. League volunteers and the career education specialist assisted with the implementation of the program.

The participants of the I(t) Work(s) and the CAP workshops completed the regular staff development activity evaluation forms. Composites of responses for 26 I(t) Work(s) participants, 66 CAP workshop participants (CAP-I), and 13 CAP follow-up workshop participants (CAP-II) follow.

	I(t) Work(s)	CAP-I	CAP-II
1. Was the activity informative and useful to you?	100%	100%	92%
2. Was the activity successful in meeting your needs?	88%	95%	77%

	I(t) Work(s)	CAP-I	CAP-II
3. Will you be able to use the skills or knowledge presented in this activity in your assignment?	88%	91%	61%
4. Do you feel that the things you learned through this activity will result in a greater sense of professional well-being?	73%	90%	69%
5. Would you recommend this activity to others?	96%	90%	77%
6. Would you recommend the consultants used for this activity?	100%	96%	54%

Summary and Conclusions

The career education specialist and the volunteers from the Junior League conducted all activities in community awareness as designed.

The career education specialist and the volunteers from the Junior League prepared the curriculum guide and conducted staff development activities designed to assist teachers with the infusion of career education into their daily lesson plans.

The Junior League provided well-planned activities, leadership and direction for a program of career education in the Tulsa Public Schools.

The career education specialist provided leadership and direction to coordinate the activities of the Junior League with those of the Tulsa Public Schools.

Recommendation

The full funding of the career education office and staff at the Education Service Center should be included in the budget of the Division of Instruction.

COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTER FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES
A Progress Report

Project Description

The Community Resource Center for the Arts and Humanities (CRCAH) continued to provide learning experiences in the arts and humanities for all students in the Tulsa Public Schools during the 1981-82 school year. The program was administered by the CRCAH and sponsored by the Arts and Humanities Council of Tulsa, Inc., and the Tulsa Public Schools. A steering committee chaired in alternate years by a Council member or a school administrator has directed the activities of the program.

The Directory of Artists and Humanists maintained by the CRCAH provided a roster of professionals who were available in the areas of creative writing, dance, drama, humanities, music, and visual arts. Artists and humanists with specialties such as puppetry, folk-singing, poetry, guitar, silkscreen, pottery and folk-dancing were scheduled for appearances in classrooms of teachers who had submitted requests.

Project Objective

To utilize the available community arts resources as an integral component of the instructional program in the Tulsa Public Schools.

Progress in Utilization of Community Resources

The Tulsa Public Schools provided $26,000 in funds for the 1981-82 school year. Approximately 66% was used for artist fees, 10% for the Artist-in-Residence, 12% for Friends of Strings and 8% for Arts in Education.

Because of a large number of requests for artists, schools were given an allotment of ten artist hours for the first semester. For the year, more than 1,200 artist hours were utilized in classrooms. Utilization in self-contained classrooms continued to increase.

The Artist-in-Residence program provided two artists for the 1981-82 school year. An artist worked with students in one junior high and two elementary schools in the area of vocal music. A native American visual artist provided instruction and activities for students at another elementary school.

The Tulsa Philharmonic provided string specialists and other services to instrumental music classes through the Friends of Strings program. In April of 1982, a questionnaire was sent to instrumental music teachers to determine their opinions of the effectiveness of the program. It was estimated that the program was available to 42 teachers and the composite of responses of 19 who returned the questionnaires follows.

	Yes Responses
1. Has a specialist from the Philharmonic spent enough hours with your students to improve their performances?	52%
2. Have any of your students been awarded private lesson scholarships through this project?	32%
3. Have instruments been provided for any of your students?	26%
4. Did any of your students participate in the Orchestra Festival on January 25?	84%
5. Did you attend the workshop during the Orchestra Festival on January 25?	74%
6. Did the Festival consultant provide suggestions to improve your string program?	53%
7. Generally, do you think that the string program in your school has improved because of this project?	48%

Teachers were asked to make comments about the program and to report what improvements had been made in their string programs. These comments were divided into elementary, junior high and senior high groupings and summarized for the instrumental music instructional assistant.

Arts in Basic Education is one component of the Oklahoma Arts in Education Program. The CRCAH provided support for this component of the program through a pilot project at Mayo and Robertson elementary schools. Arts in Basic Education is designed to expand the traditional arts experiences by integrating the arts into the curriculum. In April of 1982, a survey of the teachers at Mayo and Robertson was made to determine their opinions about the Arts in Basic Education component. It was estimated that the program was available to 37 teachers and the composite of responses from 16 who returned the surveys follows.

	Generally Agree
1. An Arts Planning Team was established for our building to plan the program to be used.	100%
2. The Team developed a plan to infuse the arts into the basic curriculum.	100%

		Generally Agree
3.	The Arts in Education staff has provided assistance with the implementation of our plan.	100%
4.	I have used the arts as activities that relate to the basic curriculum in my classroom.	94%
5.	Infusion of the arts into the curriculum is an effective supplement to my regular activities.	75%
6.	I am planning to infuse arts activities into as many of my lessons as possible in the future.	81%

Comments from teachers about the program were summarized and reported to the CRCAH steering committee and the coordinator of the Arts in Education program in the Tulsa area.

In April of 1982, an Arts in Education workshop was held for classroom teachers and arts specialists to develop activities and lessons that teach basic academic skills through the use of visual arts.

Summary and Conclusions

The CRCAH continued to provide artists and humanists in the classrooms and the program operated as designed.

The responses to the Friends of Strings varied among the schools, with some receiving valuable assistance while others reported little or no help.

From the comments made by teachers about the Arts in Education program, it was not clear that they understood the purpose of the program. References to the artist-in-residence or artists in the classrooms indicated that they had not implemented a program to integrate the arts into the basic curriculum.

Recommendations

1. In May of 1982, an ad hoc review committee recommended that the Artist-in-Residence program be discontinued because of the increase in the cost of the program. It was also recommended that these funds be added to the allocation for artists fees.

2. Workshops for integrating the arts into the basic curriculum should be offered early in the school year.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
A Progress Report

Project Description

In the spring of 1981, a plan was prepared for the development and implementation of an instructional program for children, ages four through six, based upon behavioral or developmental age in contrast to the current instructional program based primarily on chronological age. The developmental program is based on the philosophy, assessment procedures and curriculum implications of the model produced by the Gesell Institute of Human Development. The Gesell model features individual child assessment and instructional programs for children whose behavioral ages range from approximately two and one-half years through eight years.

The schools selected for the pilot project were Burroughs, Grimes, Hawthorne and Roosevelt elementary schools. The project staff included nineteen teachers, four principals, four counselors, ten psychologists, the director of psychological services and testing, and the early childhood education instructional assistant.

Project Objectives

1. To implement a program of staff development activities designed to assist teachers with early childhood education based upon developmental age.

2. To implement an early childhood education program based upon developmental age.

Progress in Staff Development

In the spring of 1981, some members of the project staff made on-site visitations to other schools in Oklahoma where developmental programs had been established.

In August of 1981, a four-day workshop was held for the project staff to meet with a Gesell Institute consultant to discuss Gesell philosophy, testing and curriculum implications. Forty-seven participants completed the regular staff development activity evaluation form and a composite of their responses follows.

	Yes Responses
1. Was the activity informative and useful to you?	100%
2. Was the activity successful in meeting your needs?	100%

	Yes Responses
3. Will you be able to use the skills or knowledge presented in this activity in your assignment?	100%
4. Do you feel that the things you learned through this activity will result in a greater sense of professional well-being?	100%
5. Would you recommend this activity to others?	85%
6. Would you recommend the consultants used for this activity?	87%

After the staff had worked with the children in developmental programs, a workshop was held in January, 1962 to review implementation strategies and the operation of the program. The consultant was from a school in which the developmental program has been in operation for several years. Twenty-five participants completed the regular staff development activity evaluation form and the composite of their responses follows.

	Yes Responses
1. Was the activity informative and useful to you?	96%
2. Was the activity successful in meeting your needs?	92%
3. Will you be able to use the skills or knowledge presented in this activity in your assignment?	96%
4. Do you feel that the things you learned through this activity will result in a greater sense of professional well-being?	100%
5. Would you recommend this activity to others?	96%
6. Would you recommend the consultants used for this activity?	100%

In February, a third workshop was held to develop individual school project plans. The four early childhood education staffs met as a group to express needs and make recommendations for their programs. Needs and recommendations were expressed in the areas of building space, materials, equipment, staff allocation and staff development. An organizational plan to replace the current kindergarten through second grade organization was proposed. Thirty-one participants completed the regular staff development activity evaluation form and the composite of their responses follows.

	Yes Responses
1. Was the activity informative and useful to you?	100%
2. Was the activity successful in meeting your needs?	100%
3. Will you be able to use the skills or knowledge presented in this activity in your assignment?	29%
4. Do you feel that the things you learned through this activity will result in a greater sense of professional well-being?	100%
5. Would you recommend this activity to others?	100%
6. Would you recommend the consultants used for this activity?	100%

Progress in Program Implementation

At the beginning of the 1981-82 school year, the ten psychologists worked with teachers to administer the Gesell tests to individual students in the four schools. The estimated developmental age was identified for each child and reported in five levels for 317 children.

Developmental Age	Number of Children
Less than 4	17
4	84
4 1/2	89
5	113
5 1/2	14

Based upon the results of the testing, children were placed in developmental programs. Brief descriptions of the programs are included in the following sections.

Burroughs

The program at Burroughs was designed for three groups of children. A half-day session was provided for those determined the least ready for kindergarten, a full-day session for those ready for kindergarten, and a developmental first grade for those who attended kindergarten but were not ready for traditional first grade. The staff included three teachers trained in early childhood education and one trained aide. Two teachers and an aide worked in the kindergarten and one teacher was assigned to the developmental first grade.

The half-day and all-day kindergarten classes were housed in a separate three-room cottage which included restrooms, drinking fountains and sinks. A large fenced playground surrounded the kindergarten building and additional equipment was installed to expand the activities for outdoor play. The three kindergarten rooms were arranged in work/activity centers and the materials and equipment were shared by both groups of children by exchanging rooms during the day. The centers included language/reading, math/science, music, cooking, sewing, blocks, pretend house, sand/water, woodworking and creative art. The materials were child centered, multi-leveled and often self-checking. The curriculum differed through the interest levels and pacing of both children and teachers. The children in the all-day class were introduced to additional extension activities and were given more responsibility for appropriate choices and completion of work.

The developmental first grade was housed in the main building in a large room that was arranged by work areas and included much of the same equipment and manipulative materials found in a kindergarten class. The curriculum evolved from the developmental needs of the children. This included reinforcement of basic foundational skills and concepts such as colors, shapes, use of the senses, and use of letters and numbers in games and tasks. The children were introduced to some purposeful paper-pencil activities and a language experience approach to reading through the use of a LEIR Kit based on the Roach Van Allen model.

Grimes

The Grimes program was patterned after that developed for Hawthorne in 1980. Children were placed according to chronological age in an extended-day tuition program for four-year-olds or an extended-day kindergarten. Both programs were in operation from 8:45 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. Those children who required bus transportation or after school care went to a Student Activity Center for an afternoon snack and supervised activities. The staff included one teacher certified in early childhood education and one trained aide in the program for four-year-olds and two early childhood education teachers and one aide in the kindergarten.

The class for the four-year-old children was housed in a prefab room which included a sink, a drinking fountain and child-sized restroom facilities. The prefab was located near the kindergarten and partially utilized the fenced kindergarten playground. The classroom was arranged in learning centers with materials available on varied developmental levels within each center. The focus of a center included language, book corner, discovery, number concepts, cooking, blocks, pretend house, sand/water, collage/woodworking, mainuplatives/motor skills or creative opportunities.

The kindergarten included two classrooms partially divided by a storeroom, a drinking fountain and restroom facilities. A large fenced playground area surrounded the entrance. Each of the rooms was arranged to accommodate approximately half of the children in work/activity centers. The rooms included different centers and the children had opportunity to work in both. One room contained the more active centers such as blocks, pretend corner, sand/water, woodworking, music/movement and large manipulatives. The other room included cooking, creative arts, listening center and table games. The teachers worked as a team and were acquainted with all of the children.

Hawthorne

Two extended-day programs were established for children at Hawthorne. A tuition program for four-year-olds was established for two classes of twenty each based upon chronological age. Four classes of kindergarten were grouped developmentally with the younger children in two self-contained classes and the older children in a team room. Both programs were in operation from 8:45 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. Those children who required bus transportation or after school care went to a Student Activity Center for an afternoon snack and supervised activities. The staff included two teachers certified in early childhood education and two trained aides in the classes for four-year-olds and four early childhood education teachers and two alternating aides in the kindergarten rooms. A fifth early childhood education teacher was assigned to a special language lab.

The classes for four-year-olds were housed in an H prefab. Each room had a sink for ready accessibility to water. The children used the hall restroom facilities and drinking fountain. There was an equipped kitchen for cooking activities for all of the early childhood groups. A fenced playground area was behind the building. The classrooms were arranged in learning centers with a wide variety and levels of materials and activities available to children. The centers included blocks, sand/water, pretend corner, language and books, number center, discovery, motor skills, sewing and creative arts.

Two of the four kindergarten classes were housed in the two-room kindergarten in the main building. These classes shared some large materials and equipment and exchanged rooms for different activities. The rooms included restroom, sink and drinking fountain facilities. A fenced playground area was accessible through one kindergarten door. Each of the rooms was arranged in work/activity centers to accommodate half of the children. One room included blocks, pretend corner, sand/water, woodworking, music and table games. The teachers worked primarily with one group of the children but planned together and sometimes worked with the total group. The two self-contained kindergarten classes were housed in the H prefab, but in rooms without sinks. These rooms contained most of the same activities and centers as used in the main building, but both of these rooms provided many manipulative activities and creative art activities to accommodate the eye-hand development of the younger children.

The language lab was housed in a small classroom in the main building. It was equipped with materials and activities that centered on language development. Small groups with a maximum of ten children came from each of the four kindergarten classrooms to work in the lab for approximately twenty-five minutes a day. Often a second teacher was available to assist the early childhood education teacher who planned the sequential activities for each small group. The group listened to a special story and spent time discussing it or writing experience stories related to what they heard. They often worked individually with a teacher or worked in groups of two to four with language games and listening centers. Multi-level books were available to the children. The activities and materials changed according to the developmental levels of the children.

Roosevelt

Children at Roosevelt were placed in a prekindergarten or kindergarten program. Four all-day kindergarten classses had been pre-enrolled heterogeneously on the basis of chronological age. The all-day prekindergarten was established as a fifth class consisting of the four developmentally youngest children taken from each of the four kindergarten classes. The staff included five early childhood education teachers and three trained aides who alternated services to the five classrooms.

The prekindergarten class was housed in a former home economics room that included three sectioned-off sink and cabinet areas. The entrance to the boys restroom that served all the kindergarten classes was accessible only through this room. The room was located adjacent to the three other kindergarten rooms and was next to the cafeteria. A stove was available in the room for cooking activities. The classroom was divided into work areas with arrangement dictated by the physical room dividers. There was an emphasis on manipulative activities and development of motor skills. Room areas included blocks, pretend corner, color/paint and paper, put-togethers and a group center. Materials have been shared from other rooms and some were newly acquired.

The four kindergarten classes were composed of two self-contained classrooms with a teacher and one group of children in each with a shared aide, and a large team room divided only by work centers with two teachers, two groups of children and one aide. There was a playground area outside the main doors. The park area immediately across the street was also used for outdoor activities. Each room was equipped with basic equipment. Some items such as a woodworking bench, sand/water tables and story books were alternated between rooms. The rooms were arranged in work centers and included blocks, pretend house, language/reading, math/science, creative materials and manipulative activities. The children were sometimes taken to the gym for motor activities.

Achievement Testing

Various achievement tests have been used in established developmental programs throughout the United States and some are reported in the Gesell literature. Some have involved pretesting and posttesting while others have used posttesting only.

In the Tulsa Public Schools, achievement tests have not been used below the second grade. The SRA Achievement Series, Level A, may be used with second semester kindergarten or first semester, first-grade children. The Level A achievement test was administered in May, 1982 to all kindergarten children in the four developmental programs. A composite of the results for 253 children follows.

Developmental Age	Number of Children	Mean Raw Scores Composite	Reading	Math	Mean EAS Quotient
Less than 4	15	28.2	43.5	13.3	82
4	59	35.8	57.5	15.9	85
4 1/2	75	43.8	72.6	19.3	91
5	91	49.3	80.2	22.0	100
5 1/2	13	53.2	86.7	23.6	110

The composite score is a weighted average of the reading and mathematics scores. Raw scores were reported because all raw score means for children below the developmental age of 5 were at the same mean grade equivalent of 0-1.

The SRA Educational Ability Series (EAS) measures developed abilities. Test items are designed to be more independent of specific curriculum content than those in the SRA Achievement Series. These items are more closely associated with reasoning ability. The EAS Quotient is a standard score with a mean of 100 for an assumed normal distribution.

No other analysis of the data was made because of a study being conducted by a doctoral student from Oklahoma State University. The purpose of the study is to determine "the effects of differential kindergarten program length on achievement among developmentally ready and unready children." The results of the study will be reported in the next progress report.

Summary and Conclusions

The staff development activities were conducted generally as designed in a Staff Development Pilot Project Proposal submitted in April, 1981.

An early childhood education program based upon developmental age was initiated in each of the four schools.

ELEMENTARY DEVELOPMENTAL MATHEMATICS
A Progress Report

Project Description

The developmental math program for the 1981-82 school year was scheduled for Alcott, Bunche, Burroughs, Celia Clinton, Cherokee, Eugene Field, Frost, Greeley, Hawthorne, Houston, Jackson, Lindsey, Mark Twain, Penn, Post, Remington, Riley, Roosevelt, Sequoyah, Springdale, Whitman, Whittier and Woods elementary schools. A total of twenty-one teachers and twenty-two aides provided basic math skills activities in 126 classes. With the guidelines for eligibility set at the thirty-fifth percentile rank or below in mathematics achievement, the program served 2,183 students in grades three through six.

Instructional activities included a short warm-up, a developmental lesson and follow-up, individualized activities and a closing activity.

During the developmental lesson, students were involved in a teacher-directed lesson which was with the total group or a small group. Guided follow-up activities were related to the developmental lesson and provided feedback to the teacher about the understanding of the concepts through chalkboard, pencil and paper, or oral activities of the students.

Those students not involved in the directed lesson were under the supervision of the aide or working on independent activities. If there were time remaining, students used various machines, kits and games to review math concepts for maintenance. For the closing, students were brought back into one group to review the lesson of that day.

Project Objective

To enable students in developmental math classes to attain a higher achievement rate than the mean achievement rate of underachievers in regular mathematics classes.

Progress in Mathematics Achievement

As a comparison group for the developmental math students, those students who scored at or below the thirty-fifth percentile rank in total mathematics on the April, 1981 SRA Achievement Series and were in regular math classes in the 44 elementary schools which did not have developmental math classes were selected. Only those students who had April, 1981 and April, 1982 SRA scores were used in each group.

Using the SRA Norms and Conversion Tables, an achievement rate was computed for each grade and the composite of students. The achievement rate was defined as the observed gain divided by the expected gain. The expected mean grade-equivalent gain, expressed in months, was projected from the percentile rank of the April, 1981 grade equivalent. Normal progress is a 1.00 achievement rate.

The mean grade-equivalent scores, gains and achievement rates for the developmental math classes and the regular math classes follow.

Underachievers in Developmental Math Classes

1982 Grade	N	Grade Equivalent April 81	Grade Equivalent April 82	Gain (Mos) Observed	Gain (Mos) Expected	Achievement Rate
3	406	1-9	3-5	+16	+ 9	1.78
4	368	2-8	3-5	+ 7	+ 4	1.75
5	533	3-1	4-6	+15	+ 3	5.00
6	338	3-6	5-5	+19	+16	1.19
Composite	1645	2-9	4-2	+13	+ 4	3.25

Underachievers in Regular Math Classes

1982 Grade	N	Grade Equivalent April 81	Grade Equivalent April 82	Gain (Mos) Observed	Gain (Mos) Expected	Achievement Rate
3	283	2-0	3-4	+14	+10	1.40
4	354	3-0	3-7	+ 7	+ 4	1.75
5	399	3-4	5-2	+18	+ 3	6.00
6	234	3-7	5-5	+18	+17	1.06
Composite	1270	3-1	4-3	+12	+ 4	3.00

Among the 23 schools with developmental math and the 44 schools without developmental math, there were various basal series and instruction materials used. In particular, 5 of the schools with developmental math and 7 of the schools without developmental math used the Holt Mathematics Management System. Generally, it appears that the variety of instructional materials would have equal impact on the achievement of underachievers in either group of schools.

Other factors which may have had an impact on achievement were the teacher effectiveness training conducted for teachers in some schools in both groups and the school effectiveness pilot project in four target schools. If the scores of the 461 developmental math students in the four target schools were taken from the scores of the 1645 students reported, the observed mean gain would be the same.

In addition, it appears that the SRA achievement scores for April, 1982 are inconsistent in some schools at various grade levels. Generally, the inconsistencies in scores appear to be evenly distributed between the two groups of schools.

Summary and Conclusions

It is assumed that the variety of instructional materials, staff development activities and the inconsistencies in SRA scores may have had equal impact on the achievement in both groups of students. Therefore, it may be assumed that the differences in achievement are results of the programs in mathematics.

Generally, the objective was achieved. The underachievers in developmental math classes gained 13 months while the underachievers in regular math classes gained 12 months.

ELEMENTARY MAGNET SCHOOLS
A Progress Report

Project Description

In April, 1979 the Tulsa Public Schools submitted to the United States Justice Department a Plan for Further Desegregation, which included, among other things, the establishment of five new elementary magnet schools. Plans were developed for magnet programs at Burroughs, Frost, Hawthorne, Roosevelt and Whitman elementary schools during the 1979-80 school year with implementation scheduled for 1980-81. Brief descriptions of the magnet features in each of the five schools are presented in the following paragraphs.

The Burroughs Tri School program was developed from the continuous progress curriculum for open-space schools used at the Burroughs Little School and other open-space schools. Kindergarten was expanded into a full-day program and an early childhood learning environment was established. The primary magnet feature was the organizational design of families of students with an instructional team which allowed a more personalized atmosphere for teaching and learning. Other magnet features were an extensive multi-media library and an electronic piano laboratory.

The Frost Science Center was established with a magnet feature of science instruction in life, earth and physical sciences. Many of the science activities were set in outdoor learning situations where students could study and profit from experiences such as organic gardening, ecology, landscaping, nature observation and conservation. Three specially trained science teachers provided instruction designed to be a blend of science process and content. The mathematics and language arts instruction was correlated with the science instruction through the emphasis of metric measurements and technical writing.

Reading and mathematics were emphasized at the Hawthorne Basic Skills School. The program featured a strong basic skills curriculum with self-contained classes for first through third graders and a semi-departmental design for fourth through sixth graders. A preschool program for four-year-olds patterned after the Early Childhood Development Center program was in operation and the Student Activity Center was available before and after the regular school day for the children of working parents.

The Plan for Further Desegregation called for the closing of Roosevelt Junior High School and Pershing Elementary School at the end of the 1978-79 school year, and the reopening of Roosevelt as an elementary school for 1979-80. The Roosevelt Basic Skills School featured a strong basic skills curriculum with self-contained classes for first through third graders and a semi-departmental design for fourth through sixth graders. Other magnet features included a comprehensive physical education program and an extended-day kindergarten. A Student Activities Center was in operation before and after school for the chidren of working parents.

Whitman Elementary School offered a continuous progress curriculum for kindergarten through sixth grade. The magnet feature was an all-day gifted child educational program for children in kindergarten through fourth grade. The Quest and Challenge Center provided resource materials and supplementary activities to enhance talent development. Violin instruction utilizing the Suzuki Method was provided as an enrichment activity.

Project Objective

To reduce the racial isolation of approximately 1,400 black elementary students and to enrich the educational programs available to them.

Progress in Desegregation

Progress in desegregation may be followed through the reports of ethnic distribution of pupils in the Tulsa Public Schools. The racial distribution of students in the five magnet schools for the 1978-79 school year through the 1981-82 school year follows.

School	Sept.26, 1978		Sept.28, 1979		Oct.1, 1980		Oct.1, 1981	
	Black	Non-Black	Black	Non-Black	Black	Non-Black	Black	Non-Black
Burroughs	87.4%	12.6%	84.4%	15.1%	70.2%	29.8%	62.0%	38.0%
Frost	98.6%	1.4%	97.1%	1.7%	83.6%	16.4%	73.0%	27.0%
Hawthorne	95.4%	4.6%	96.4%	3.1%	85.9%	14.1%	83.1%	16.9%
Roosevelt	---	---	31.8%	53.2%	40.6%	59.4%	50.4%	49.6%
Whitman	97.9%	2.1%	98.5%	1.5%	89.3%	10.7%	79.9%	20.1%

Conclusion

Generally, the racial isolation of black elementay students has been reduced in the five magnet schools.

ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
A Progress Report

Project Description

The Holt School Mathematics Management System continued as a supplement made available to teachers in schools using the Holt mathematics materials as their basal series. During the 1981-82 school year, management materials were used at Emerson, Frost, Fulton, Grimes, Hawthorne, Hoover, Jones, Mitchell, Ross, Sandburg, Whitman and Whittier elementary schools. Materials were used with third through sixth-grade students in most of the schools.

The management system involved the use of pretesting to determine individual lesson assignments, workbooks, drill sheets, worksheets with audiotapes, and posttesting. A student record card was used to summarize the progress of each student through more than one hundred content levels covering first through eighth grades.

Project Objectives

1. To provide a mathematics management system as a supplement to the Holt mathematics series.
2. To enable students to achieve at or above their expected learner rates in mathematics.

Progress in Utilization

In the 12 schools using the Holt management system, it was estimated that materials were available to 90 teachers. In May of 1982, a survey was sent to these teachers to give them an opportunity to express their opinions about the effectiveness of the program. A composite of the responses from 38 teachers, together with the composite of 30 teachers from the 1981 survey follow.

	Generally Agree	
	1981	1982
1. The pretest/posttest component of the system has functioned satisfactorily.	66%	79%
2. I have been able to use the student record card to my satisfaction.	47%	53%
3. The record card has been useful in parent conferences.	33%	65%

		Generally Agree	
		1981	1982
4.	I have correlated the test results to textbook assignments and other learning activities.	83%	85%
5.	The workbooks have been a satisfactory supplement to other learning activities.	80%	74%
6.	The drill sheets have been a satisfactory supplement to other learning activities.	83%	81%
7.	The worksheets/tapes have been a satisfactory supplement to other learning activities.	77%	73%
8.	I have been able to use the testing, record card and other materials without devoting more time to them than I had been using with other materials.	37%	50%
9.	My students like using these materials.	63%	84%
10.	This management system enhances the learning environment for my students.	50%	63%

Teachers were also asked to make comments about the program. The responses were varied and were mostly positive about the program in general. Some comments were about specific problems in the use of a particular component. All comments were compiled in a report for the project director.

Progress in Achievement

Assuming that most teachers in the 12 schools used the Holt management materials, the mathematics progress of all students in grades three through six was analyzed. The total mathematics scores from the April, 1981 and the April, 1982 SRA Achievement Series were used in the analysis. Only those students who had both scores were included.

Using the SRA Norms and Conversion Tables, an achievement rate was computed for each grade. The achievement rate was defined as the observed gain divided by the expected gain. The expected mean grade-equivalent gain, expressed in months, was projected from the percentile rank of the April, 1981 grade equivalent. Normal progress is a 1.00 achievement rate.

The mean grade-equivalent scores, gains and achievement rates for 1,426 students in schools using the Holt management materials follow.

1982 Grade	N	Grade Equivalent April 81	April 82	Gain (Mos) Observed	Expected	Achievement Rate
3	361	3-0	4-1	+11	+12	0.92
4	329	3-7	4-7	+10	+10	1.00
5	379	4-6	6-3	+17	+10	1.70
6	357	6-0	7-1	+11	+11	1.00

Among the 12 schools using the Holt management materials, there were various supplementary instructional materials used. In particular, 5 of the schools had mathematics classes in the developmental mathematics program. These schools were lower-achieving schools than the other 7 and a direct comparison of achievement cannot be made because of the wide range of grade-equivalent levels on the April, 1981 tests. However, some impact of combined programs may be reflected in the achievement rates. The results for the 5 schools with developmental mathematics classes and the 7 schools without developmental mathematics classes follow.

Holt with Developmental Mathematics

1982 Grade	N	Grade Equivalent April 81	April 82	Gain (Mos) Observed	Expected	Achievement Rate
3	174	2-7	3-7	+10	+11	0.91
4	124	3-5	4-0	+ 5	+ 6	0.83
5	146	3-7	5-6	+19	+ 8	2.38
6	157	5-2	6-2	+10	+11	0.91

Holt without Developmental Mathematics

1982 Grade	N	Grade Equivalent April 81	April 82	Gain (Mos) Observed	Expected	Achievement Rate
3	187	3-2	4-5	+13	+14	0.93
4	205	4-2	5-3	+11	+10	1.10
5	233	5-4	6-6	+12	+ 8	1.50
6	200	6-5	8-1	+16	+15	1.07

It appears that the SRA achievement scores for April, 1982 are inconsistent in some schools at various grade levels. Generally, the inconsistencies in scores appear to have had some impact on achievement as indicated by the following district means in total mathematics.

District Means

1982 Grade	Grade Equivalent April 81	Grade Equivalent April 82	Gain (Mos) Observed	Gain (Mos) Expected	Achievement Rate
3	3-0	4-2	+12	+12	1.00
4	3-8	4-8	+10	+10	1.00
5	4-5	6-3	+18	+10	1.80
6	6-0	7-3	+13	+ 9	1.44

Summary and Conclusions

The program operated at various levels of utilization among the schools. Since it was not a highly structured, uniformly implemented program, it is difficult to measure the impact of the management system on mathematics achievement.

It is assumed that the supplementary instructional materials and the inconsistencies in SRA scores may have had equal impact among the 12 schools. In Holt management schools, third, fourth and fifth grade achievement rates were about the same as the district means, while the sixth grade rate fell below the district mean.

ELEMENTARY READING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
A Progress Report

Project Description

The reading management system installed in 1978-79 as a pilot program at Patrick Henry Elementary School was expanded to include Addams, Alcott, Cherokee, Grimes, McClure, McKinley, Post and Riley elementary schools in grades two through six for the 1979-80 school year. For 1980-81, Barnard, Bunche, Burroughs, Celia Clinton, Emerson, Eugene Field, Frost, MacArthur, Marshall, Mitchell and Phillips elementary schools were added to the program.

In September of 1980, the program was offered to all schools as a supplement to the basal reading programs. Management materials were available upon request by the principal.

During the 1981-82 school year, most teachers already using the program continued with many of the management materials and teachers from Columbus, Lee and Mayo requested management materials.

Inservice activities for the principals and teachers were provided by the Educational Progress Corporation (EPC) as the program was developed. The focus of the inservice sessions was on test administration, test results interpretation and the implementation of the program. A consultant from EPC assisted the school district reading specialists with the preparation of a guide for teachers in the use of the program as a supplement to their regular instruction in the various basal series used in the schools.

The EPC reading management materials included the Individualized Criterion Referenced Testing (CRT), the Audio Reading Progress Laboratory (ARPL), the Audio Reading Kits (ARK), the Clues to Reading Progress (CLUES), reading Benchmarks, Backups and the individual pupil Reading Profile. The basic reading skills in the program were arranged on a continuum of 345 objectives in levels 1 through 8. Levels correspond approximately to the traditional grade levels.

Project Objectives

1. To provide a reading management system as a supplement to basal reading series.

2. To enable students to achieve at or above their expected learner rates in reading.

Progress in Utilization

In the 23 schools using the EPC materials, it was estimated that materials were available to 218 teachers. In April of 1982, a survey was sent to each of these teachers to determine the level of utilization and to provide an opportunity to express opinions about the effectiveness of the program. A composite of the responses from 101 teachers follows.

Program Component	Percent of Utilization
Testing and computer printout	95%
ARPL	97%
Ark	29%
Clues	42%
Benchmarks	84%
Backups	18%
ICRT Reading Profile	90%
Class Objectives Chart	75%

		Generally Agree
1.	The materials are valuable supplements to my basal reading activities.	71%
2.	I like to use the materials on a regular basis.	62%
3.	My students like to use the materials.	71%
4.	The materials give me more information about the progress of my students than other materials I have used.	30%
5.	The materials provide information which is useful in parent conferences.	66%
6.	I think this program is an effective management system.	43%
7.	I plan to continue using the EPC materials.	68%

Teachers were also asked to make comments about the program. The responses were varied with some positive and some negative comments about the program in general. Many comments were about specific problems in the use of a particular component. All comments were compiled in a report for the project director and the EPC consultant.

Progress in Achievement

Assuming that most teachers in the 23 schools used some of the EPC materials, the reading progress of all students in grades three through six was analyzed. The total reading scores from the April, 1981 and the April, 1982 SRA Achievement Series were used in the analysis. Only those students who had both scores were included.

Using the SRA Norms and Conversion Tables, an achievement rate was computed for each grade. The achievement rate was defined as the observed gain divided by the expected gain. The expected mean grade-equivalent gain, expressed in months, was projected from the percentile rank of the April, 1981 grade equivalent. Normal progress is a 1.00 achievement rate.

The mean grade-equivalent scores, gains and achievement rates for 3,078 students in schools using EPC materials follow.

1982		Grade Equivalent		Gain (Mos)		Achievement
Grade	N	April 81	April 82	Observed	Expected	Rate
3	720	2-9	4-1	+12	+12	1.00
4	758	3-8	5-2	+14	+10	1.40
5	841	4-8	6-3	+15	+ 9	1.67
6	759	6-1	7-5	+14	+12	1.16

Among the 23 schools using the EPC materials, there were various basal series and instructional materials used. In particular, 8 of the schools had reading classes using New Century materials. These schools were lower-achieving schools than the other 15 and a direct comparison of achievement cannot be made because of the wide range of grade-equivalent levels on the April, 1981 tests. However, some impact of combined programs may be reflected in the achievement rates. The results for the 8 schools with New Century classes and the 15 schools without New Century classes follow.

EPC with New Century

1982		Grade Equivalent		Gain (Mos)		Achievement
Grade	N	April 81	April 82	Observed	Expected	Rate
3	255	2-2	2-8	+ 6	+ 7	0.86
4	263	2-8	4-3	+15	+ 7	2.14
5	271	3-7	5-5	+18	+ 7	2.57
6	175	4-4	6-0	+16	+12	1.33

EPC without New Century

1982 Grade	N	Grade Equivalent April 81	Grade Equivalent April 82	Gain (Mos) Observed	Gain (Mos) Expected	Achievement Rate
3	465	3-5	4-7	+12	+11	1.09
4	495	4-4	5-7	+13	+11	1.18
5	570	5-4	6-6	+12	+ 8	1.50
6	584	6-5	8-2	+17	+16	1.06

It appears that the SRA achievement scores for April, 1982 are inconsistent in some schools at various grade levels. Generally, the inconsistencies in scores appear to have had some impact on achievement as indicated by the following district means in total reading.

District Means

1982 Grade	Grade Equivalent April 81	Grade Equivalent April 82	Gain (Mos) Observed	Gain (Mos) Expected	Achievement Rate
3	2-6	4-1	+15	+ 9	1.67
4	3-6	4-9	+13	+10	1.30
5	4-8	6-2	+16	+ 9	1.78
6	6-0	6-9	+ 9	+10	0.90

Summary and Conclusions

The program was loosely structured and operated according to various levels of utilization among the schools. In this situation, it is difficult to measure the impact of the program on reading achievement.

It is assumed that the variety of instructional materials and the inconsistencies in SRA scores may have had equal impact among the 23 schools. By comparing the achievement at each grade level with the district means, third and fifth grade achievement fell below the means while fourth and sixth grade achievement in EPC schools fell above the means.

JUNIOR HIGH LEARNING CENTER
A Progress Report

Project Description

The Junior High Learning Center was established in 1972 to fill the needs of junior high students who were about to be excluded from the regular school program because of their behavior and attendance problems. The Center provided an environment in which students could practice acceptable social and academic behaviors away from the pressures and problems they were having at their home schools. Attending regular classes a half-day allowed students to practice newly-learned skills in their original problem environment.

Students who demonstrated some potential for behavioral change or improvement were referred to the Center by their home schools. Each student was tested before entry to separate the retarded and severely emotionally disturbed children who need a different type of program from children who were having behavior problems. After the student was evaluated, the application and test results were sent to a core committee to determine if the student qualified for the Center. The first two weeks were a trial to see if the student should be accepted for continued placement. Upon entering the Center, each student was provided an MTTA bus pass for his transportation to-and-from the Center. As the students learned new methods of coping with school problems at the Center, they were able to practice these methods at their home schools. This process eased the transition back to the home schools.

Students attended the Center for one-half of a regular school day, and the Center conducted two half-day sessions. The curriculum included English, art, social studies and mathematics. For the other half-day, students maintained enrollment at their home schools for elective subjects such as physical education, shop and science. Each student was evaluated upon entry to determine achievement levels and appropriate placement in instructional materials. The student was then placed in an individualized learning program in each class.

Students at the Center agreed to participate in a behavior modification program based on token rewards. In return for working and socially accepted behavior, the student was able to accumulate $110 worth of paper money each day. The token economy was a tool for students to learn to get teacher attention in an acceptable manner. Students used their paper money to purchase breaks and entertainment during free time as well as needed school supplies.

At the end of each day, the entire student body and staff attended a "secromby" session. Students rated their individual performances for that day on a four-point scale. Each teacher then rated the individual students and commented about behavior in a non-judgmental way. The student and teacher ratings were averaged to get one overall rating for the day. This helped the students to recognize their mistakes and learn from them and also to recognize their successes and be proud of them. Those with the highest points for the week purchased free time for less money. In addition, their pictures were displayed on an honor poster in the office.

Project Objectives

1. To provide an environment in which junior high students can practice acceptable social and academic behavior.

2. To enable the students to return to regular classes and demonstrate acceptable social and academic behavior.

Progress at the Learning Center

Progress at the Learning Center was to have been evaluated by surveys from students and parents and by an on-site evaluation team of professional educators. Because of the time involved in conducting such surveys, they were not completed for the 1981-82 school year. Because of the difficulty in designing an instrument for observers to use at the Learning Center, the on-site visitations were not made. The evaluation of progress at the Learning Center is tentatively scheduled for the 1982-83 school year.

Progress at Home Schools

In the spring of 1982, counselors at each of the junior high schools were asked to complete surveys requesting information on students attending the Junior High Learning Center.

A survey form was requested for each student who attended the Center during the 1981-82 school year. Counselors returned fifty-six out of the seventy-nine questionnaires which were requested. Of these fifty-six students, twenty-nine students continued to attend their home school for one-half day while twenty-seven students did not maintain their half-day enrollment at their home school. The survey results from the twenty-nine students attending their home schools follow.

	Yes Responses
1. Did the student profit from attending the Junior High Learning Center?	69%
2. Did you notice any improvement in the student's attendance at school?	24%

	Yes Responses
3. Did you notice any improvement in the student's grades at school?	52%
4. Did you notice any improvement in the number of discipline referrals for this student?	55%
5. Did you notice any improvement in the number of suspensions for this student?	55%
6. Did you notice any improvement in the student's attitude toward school?	62%
7. Was your working relationship with the Junior High Learning Center satisfactory?	100%

Counselors were asked to make suggestions for improving the operation of the Center. The only suggestions given were in regard to the need for communication between the Center and the junior high school about student attendance.

Counselors were also asked for comments about the Center. All of the comments reflected a need for the Center and appreciation for the way the Center fulfills this need.

Summary and Conclusions

Only half of the students enrolled in the Center maintained their enrollment at their home junior high schools. Most of the students who maintained enrollments at the junior high schools did not show any improvement in their attendance record.

At the same time, students attending junior high schools did show that they profited by attending the Center. An improvement was seen in their grades, number of discipline referrals, number of suspensions and their attitude toward school.

Recommendation

A means of communicating about student attendance between the Junior High Learning Center and the junior high school should be devised so that the two schools can work cooperatively toward keeping students enrolled in school.

MATHEMATICS MANAGEMENT/MICROCOMPUTER MATHEMATICS
A Progress Report

Project Description

A mathematics management system and microcomputer exercises were continued as supplements to the regular program used by the instructional team at Carver Middle School for the 1981-82 school year. Students in grades six through eight had used the Holt School Mathematics textbooks and materials in their regular program of activities.

The Holt School Mathematics Management System was added to the existing Holt program to provide diagnostic testing, individual prescriptive lessons, workbooks, drill sheets and worksheets with audio tapes. Lessons were correlated with the regular Holt textbook and materials. A student record card was available to summarize the progress of each student through the various content levels.

As an additional supplement, Radio Shack TRS-80 microcomputers were used to reinforce basic skills in mathematics. Seven computers were available in a room near the library resource center area. Students were scheduled for specific periods of time on the computer for math skills reinforcement. The program software was based upon the MicroComputer Mathematics Program developed by the Dallas Independent School District and was modified to run on the TRS-80. An aide was on duty in the computer room to assist students.

Project objectives

1. To provide a management system for mathematics instruction.
2. To provide a program of microcomputer exercises to reinforce basic skills in mathematics.

Progress in Utilization

In May of 1982, the teachers at Carver were asked to respond to a survey concerning the utilization of the Holt management system and the microcomputers. A composite of the responses from 4 teachers, together with the composite from the 1981 survey follow.

Holt Management

	Generally Agree 1981	Generally Agree 1982
1. The pretest/posttest component of the system has functioned satisfactorily.	100%	100%

		Generally Agree	
		1981	1982
2.	I have been able to use the student record card to my satisfaction.	25%	0%
3.	The record card has been useful in parent conferences.	25%	25%
4.	I have correlated the test results to textbook assignments and other learning activities.	100%	100%
5.	The workbooks have been a satisfactory supplement to other learning activities.	100%	75%
6.	The drill sheets have been a satisfactory supplement to other learning activities.	100%	100%
7.	The worksheets/tapes have been a satisfactory supplement to other learning activities.	100%	100%
8.	I have been able to use the testing, record card and other materials without devoting more time to them than I had been using with other materials.	25%	50%
9.	My students like using these materials.	0%	75%
10.	This management system enhances the learning environment for my students.	25%	25%

Microcomputers

		Generally Agree	
		1981	1982
1.	The computers are located in an appropriate area for easy access and use.	100%	25%
2.	The students are able to use the computers to my satisfaction.	50%	25%
3.	The aide has met my needs for assistance with the computer operation.	100%	50%
4.	Most of my students like using the computers.	100%	100%
5.	My students have enough time on the computers.	0%	0%
6.	There are enough computer exercises to correlate with most of my lesson plans.	0%	75%

	Generally Agree 1981	Generally Agree 1982
7. The computer lessons correlate well enough with my lesson plans.	25%	75%
8. The use of the computer in this program design is an effective way to reinforce basic skills.	100%	100%
9. The use of the computer in this program design is an effective supplement to my program.	100%	100%

Teachers were asked to make comments about the management system and the microcomputers. All comments were summarized and reported to the instructional assistant for secondary mathematics.

Summary and Conclusions

It is difficult to generalize the effectiveness of a management system based upon the utilization of the system in one school. The management system appears to be loosely structured and not fully utilized at Carver. The record card has not been used and teachers are not in full agreement about continuing with the management system.

It appears that the computers were not located in an apropriate area, are not used by students as desired by the teachers, and there was not enough time scheduled for students to use the computers.

MINIMUM COMPETENCY TESTING STANDARDS
A Progress Report

Project Description

In 1978, after an intensive study which included a review of the professional literature in the field and a review of the status of state and nationwide legislation, an Advisory Task Force on Minimum Competency Testing prepared recommendations for reading and mathematics competency testing in the Tulsa Public Schools. The concept of minimum competency testing standards, as reported by the Task Force, meant "relating the extent of competency achieved by a student to expected achievement according to a previously determined cut-off point or at a prescribed minimum level of proficiency."

Also among the recommendations was a proposed management system which included minimum competency skills testing periods. Grades three, six, seven, nine, eleven and twelve were identified in the management system as checkpoints for testing.

During the 1981-82 school year, a pilot program was developed to offer reading and mathematics instruction for third-grade students who were identified as achieving below minimum competency testing standards. The reading and mathematics specialists worked with the testing director to plan the program of testing for the spring and summer of 1982.

Project Objective

To implement a summer school skills immersion program for children below minimum competency testing standards in reading and mathematics.

Progress in Implementation

Third-grade students were tested with the SRA Achievement Series, Level D, in March of 1982. All children scoring at grade level 2-9 or below on the composite score were eligible for a district-funded summer school of reading and mathematics instruction. The composite score is a weighted average of the total scores from the reading, language arts and mathematics subtests.

The test results identified 555 children for summer school eligibility and summer programs were established at Burroughs, Cooper, Eugene Field, Greeley, Hoover, Jackson and Woods elementary schools to accommodate the various geographic concentrations of children to be served. Letters were sent to notify parents about the summer program. Enrollment forms were returned for 461 children and a transportation schedule was prepared to meet their needs.

The summer school staff included a director, a reading coordinator, a mathematics coordinator, fourteen teachers and fourteen aides. Each school had one reading teacher with an aide, and one mathematics teacher with an aide.

Summer classes were scheduled from 8:00 a.m. to 12 noon, Monday through Friday, in each of the seven schools for six weeks of instruction and testing. Children were transported from their home school areas in two groups. The first group was scheduled for the first two hours, with each child spending one hour in reading and one hour in mathematics. The second group was enrolled for the second two hours with the same instructional schedule.

The curriculum for the summer skills immersion classes included the New Century reading program and a modified developmental mathematics program. The modified developmental mathematics program utilized a new instructional guide which included a more highly structured outline for instructional pacing and an outline of instruction for each day. New Century reading and developmental mathematics have been included in the curriculum for underachievers during the regular school year.

Competency Testing

The progress of the 555 children who fell below the minimum competency testing standard will be monitored through the following checkpoints in reading, language arts and mathematics.

Testing Date	Tests
March, 1982	SRA, Level D
July, 1982	SRA, Level C
April, 1983	SRA, Level E

The progress of the 461 children who attended the immersion classes will be compared with the SRA growth scale norms in reading and mathematics.

The progress of the 94 children eligible for summer school, but did not attend, will be compared with the SRA growth scale norms in reading and mathematics.

SECONDARY READING/ENGLISH SKILLS IMMERSION
A Progress Report

Project Description

A junior high reading skills immersion program initiated during the 1979-80 school year continued and a senior high English skills immersion program was initiated during the 1981-82 school year. Students at Bell and Foster junior highs and Memorial senior high participated in skills immersion activities.

In addition to the regular activities in the seventh and eighth grade English programs, the teachers at Bell and Foster targeted a block of comprehension and vocabulary skills that would be the core of the six-week immersion unit. Supplementary materials included Reading for Concepts, Reading Tactics, Reading 720 and various reinforcement activities through worksheets and drills.

The program at Memorial was designed for tenth and eleventh-grade students as a college preparatory immersion unit in reading, vocabulary, grammar and test-taking skills. In August of 1981, a consultant from the College Skills Center met with the teachers as a part of the two-day workshop to prepare for the implementation of the program. Topics included vocabulary, basic grammar, test-taking skills and classroom strategies.

Materials for the nine-week immersion unit at Memorial were three levels of reading comprehension workbooks, three levels of vocabulary practice workbooks and the Master Kit for Mini-Tests in Taking Tests. The Master Kit was based upon the SRA Achievement Series, which is used for testing eleventh-grade students in the Tulsa Public Schools.

Project Objectives

1. To increase skills in reading comprehension.

2. To increase skills in vocabulary usage.

Progress in Reading Achievement

The program was initiated at Bell for seventh and eighth graders. At Foster, the program continued for seventh graders and was expanded to include eighth graders. The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests were used for seventh graders at Foster and the Nelson Reading Test was used for Bell seventh graders and all eighth graders in both schools. The mean reading comprehension scores follow.

School	Grade	N	Grade Equivalent Pre	Post
Bell	7	98	7.5	6.9
	8	27	6.1	4.7
Foster	7	217	7.1	6.1
	8	182	8.1	9.2

For the program at Memorial, the California Reading Test was administered to tenth and eleventh graders. The mean reading comprehension scores follow.

Grade	N	Grade Equivalent Pre	Post
10	410	10.5	11.2
11	385	11.5	12.4

Progress in Vocabulary Achievement

The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests and the Nelson Reading Test contain subtests for vocabulary. The mean vocabulary scores follow.

School	Grade	N	Grade Equivalent Pre	Post
Bell	7	98	8.1	8.8
	8	27	6.8	6.7
Foster	7	217	7.2	7.4
	8	182	9.2	9.8

The vocabulary subtest of the California Achievement Test was used to measure progress in vocabulary usage at Memorial. The mean vocabulary scores follow.

Grade	N	Grade Equivalent Pre	Post
10	402	10.9	11.2
11	384	12.5	12.7

Summary and Conclusions

Most standardized tests are not normed for use at six-week or nine-week intervals. As a result, it is difficult to draw conclusions about gains in reading comprehension or vocabulary achievement.

The Gates-MacGinitie Technical Manual provided a formula for determining the statistical significance of differences in means for a group taking different forms of the test during the same year. The loss in comprehension was significant and the gain in vocabulary was significant for the seventh-grade students at Foster.

The Nelson Test provided no information about determining significant differences.

The California Achievement Tests Examiner's Manual provided information about the achievement development scale scores which may be read from a table for any level or form of the test. The t-test for two related samples may be used with scale scores to determine the significance in the differences in means. For the Memorial students, there was a significant difference in the comprehension means and no significant difference in the vocabulary means.

Recommendations

1. Criterion-referenced tests constructed by a committee of skills immersion teachers should be considered by the project teachers and the instructional assistant. For the vocabulary section in particular, many words used in an immersion unit may not be included in the sample selected for a standardized achievement test.

2. If the use of standardized tests is to be continued, then a comparison group of students not in an immersion program should be established. The regular SRA tests could be used if a study of the impact of the immersion program on the SRA achievement were to be made.